Roman-Catholick Doctrines

NO NOVELTIES:

OR AN

ANSWER

TO

Dr. PIERCE'S *Court-Sermon,*

Mis-call'd

The Primitive Rule of Reformation.

By *S. C.* a Roman-Catholick.

1 PET. 3. 15.

Parati semper ad satisfactionem omni poscenti vos rationem de eâ quæ in vobis est spe, cum modestiâ & timore, conscientiam habentes bonam, ut in eo quod detrahunt vobis confundantur.

MDC LX III.

TO THE

Queen-Mother.

MADAM,

IT *cannot be doubted but* your Majesty *has of late been a great Sufferer, in being forced to hear frequent and loud* Triumphs *for a supposed* Victory, *which, by a* Court-Sermon, *scarce an hour long, the* English Pro-

teſtant Church *at one blow, and without any reſiſtance, pretends to have gained over* the Catholick.

But your ſufferings were much more encreaſed, when you ſaw the immediatly following effects of that and ſeveral other Sermons *of the like ſtile, which,* by concert, *at the ſame time proclaimed diſtruction to that very* Chriſtianity, *which firſt expelled* Paganiſm *out of our Nation.*

Your Majeſty *has oftentimes heretofore been wakened and affrighted with ſuch* Alarmes: *But then the* Trumpets *were blown by men whoſe Profeſſion and* Religion *obliged them to renounce all humanity towards* us, *and all reſpect to* Monarchy. *Whereas this laſt unexpected* blaſt *proceeded from thoſe, who, even but yeſterday, promiſed us, as a reward for our common ſufferings, a ſecurity from thoſe our common Enemies, whoſe malice and rage we only apprehended.*

God forbid *we ſhould be aſtoniſh'd, as if ſome ſtrange thing hapned to us, to ſee our* Religion *perſecutea: It is impoſsible it ſhould be otherwiſe, becauſe the great Enemy of Truth and Charity wil never be reconciled to live at peace with either. Yet when we ſee ſo*

wonderful

wonderful and ſo ſudden a change in formerly profeſſed Friends, when not only the hands, *but the* voice *of* Jacob, *are become the* voice *and* hands *of* Eſau: *And when we, examining our ſelves, can neither find nor ſuſpect any demerit to provoke our* Proteſtant Friends *againſt us; nor ſo much as imagin, what advantage they can gain by our ruine, but rather an apparent harm to themſelves: This being a* Caſe of ſuffering, *for the entertaining which we have no* Pattern *to prepare us, and for mitigating which, all rational means are uneffectual, we cannot forbid our ſelves a little to wonder at it: Yet this great* Bleſſing *we may reap from it, that thereby we are even forced to our own happineſs, by having recourſe for comfort and deliverance to* God *onely, who, when the World goes fartheſt from us, Himſelf approaches neareſt to us, and looking fixedly on him, we ſhall diſcover, by his Divine Light, how our* unexampled *ingratitudes have extorted from him* unexampled *puniſhments.*

So many years of oppreſſions, and ſuch viciſſitudes in them, have not diminiſhed much leſs changed the conſtancy of our affections to Creatures; we have paſſionately loved the

World, even when it was bitter to us; When God *called us to* mourning *and penitential humiliations, we diſſembled the taking notice of it: In the midſt of perſecutions we contended in pride and vain jollities with our Oppreſſors: Yet now we ſee how mercifully* God *deals with us, leſt our former miſeries ſhould prove beginnings of eternal ones, he has brought upon us theſe new and unfore-ſeen afflictions, for a laſt Tryal whether* his mighty hand *can* humble us, *or no. He has ſeen that the* fidelity *we perform'd to our Temporal* Governors, *and the charitable aſſiſtance we afforded to our fellow-ſuffring* Brethren *we perhaps expected ſhould be recompenſed by them in this life. Therefore he will have us continue the ſame* Duties *more cordially, now that we know and ſee that* himſelf *only muſt be our reward. Our complaints and prayers (which are ſo far from mitigating, that they rather incenſe ſome ſpirits againſt us) he will force us to addreſſe to himſelf onely; which if we do as we ought, and mend our lives under his correction, we ſhal certainly pacify him, and, when he ſees it for our good, conciliate men to us alſo; ſince for this laſt, which onely can be doubted, we have no*

leſſe

leſſe engagement than that of his own Word: When the waies of a man pleaſe our Lord, he will convert even his Enemies to him. Prov. 16. 7.

Madam, *theſe reflections I can with much more aſſurance repreſent to* your Majeſties *conſideration, becauſe, though hitherto the too common inſenſibility of* Catholicks *to* God's *Viſitations, has been much aggravated by our neglect to follow ſo Chriſtian an example of humiliation, penitential auſterities, contempt of worldly vanities, and delight in ſolitary retraits to converſe with* God, *as your* Majeſty *has afforded; yet it is now at laſt to be hoped, that in the preſent diſperſion of* Catholic Paſtors, *if your* Majeſty *could joyn your* Authority *with your* Example, *they both together would prove forcible means to invite all* Catholics *to a ſerious compunction for their former miſcarriages, to an acknowledgment, not only of the juſtice, but even mercifulneſs of* our Lord's *Viſitations, to a willingneſs in ſuffring for* him, *and an expectation of deliverance onely from* him.

Never certainly did our Nation, *nor perhaps any other afford two* Catholic *Courts ſuch perfect* Schools *of* Piety, *in which there are* two ſuch Miſtreſſes, *of moſt peculiarly*

Chriſtian, *though ſeldom found to be* courtly, vertues; *ſuch are* Humility, Mortification, Penance, zeal for true Religion, equanimity in Suffrings, aſſiduous and unwearied Devotions, &c. *But in a Generation ſo perverſe as this, it muſt be ſomwhat more then* Example, *that can render theſe* vertues faſhionable *abroad alſo. Inſenſible, vain, tepid, and negligent* Catholics *muſt ſee themſelvs reprehended by the ſeveriti of* your Majeſties *looks, and if need be, condemned by* your *charitable reproofi. Bravery and curioſity of Attires, precious time miſpent in vain Converſations and Viſits, magnificence in entertainments, diſſolution in dancing, &c. are juſtly to be eſteem'd* crimes *unpardonable in thoſe upon whom the* hand of our Lord *lies ſo* heavy.

There is no joy now ſeaſonable, nor indeed excuſable among Catholics, *but a* Joy *in* ſuffring *for truth and fidelity; For we never had, till now, ſo comfortable a refreſhment to our afflictions. It is now made evident that our only* fault *is that which is our greateſt* glory. *We are threatned more ſeverely then ever, whilſt we are declared moſt innocent. In former* Edicts *for execution of* Laws *the prin-*

principal motives were a care for ſafety of his Majeſties Perſon, and the ſecurity of the State and Government; *Withdrawing of Subjects from their natural* Allegiance; *contriving of Seditious and* Treaſonable practiſes; *maintaining of* rebellious principles, &c. *were* formerly *our pretended crimes. Such was the* ſtile *in which* the late deſolating Parliament *repreſented to our moſt* Excellent King *of glorious* memory, *a neceſsity of perſecuting and deſtroying his moſt faithful* Catholic Subjects, *when, God knowes, both His ſafety and ſecurity of the Government was at the ſame time in deſign, and ſhortly after in effect, deſtroy'd only by the* Repreſenters *themſelves.*

But now Treaſon *is left out of our* charge: *Nor is there any apprehenſion of the leaſt danger from us to his* Majeſties Perſon *or the State: Nay, ſo publickly and conſtantly have we aſſerted the innocence of our* Religion *in the Point of* fidelity *to* Princes, *and ſuch unqueſtioned proofs thereof have we given by our actions, that the* Honorable Peers *of* this very Parliament *were in an immediate preparation of mind to antiquate all the* Sanguinary Laws *againſt us*: God *Almighty*

give

give repentance and pardon to the unhappy obstructors *of that* grace.

Yet for all our innocence, Preachers *must be satisfied: They cry aloud their fears of the* increase of Popery; *when as, for one new-professed* Catholic, *who forsakes their* Churches, *hundreds of all other* Sects *relinquish both their* Churches *and* Allegiance *too. They impute as a Crime to* us, *what all other* Sects *impute to them, and themselves glory in, that* we receive our Ordinations from Rome, *that is, that we are not a separated* Sect, *but* members *of the true* Catholic Church. *For if there be indeed a* Catholic Church, *Ordinations must be derived into particular Countries from a* Common Principle *and Fountain, otherwise the Cement of Union and* Subordination *is dissolved.*

But what esteem our former Princes *had of this pretended Crime, will appear by a late example given by his* Majesty *of happy memory, He had graciously reprieved a* Priest *condemned at the* Old Bayly. *Hereupon* the Commons *in the late* unhappy Parliament *A.D.* 1640. *by* Mr. Glyn, *request the* Lords *to joyn in a* Petition *to his* Majesty, to be informed who should dare to be instrumen-

Sanderson's Hist. pag. 349. out of the Records of the House of Commons, 1640.

tal

tal in retarding Juſtice in the face of the Parliament: *To which the* King *by the* Lord Privy Seal (28 January) *tels them* the cauſe of the reprieve was, becauſe the man was found guilty, as being a Prieſt only; upon which account neither King *James*, nor Queen *Elizabeth* ever exerciſed the penal Lawes. *Notwithſtanding, his* Majeſty *left the* Priſoner *to their wills, to live or dye, according to their Votes; and thereby he eſcaped; for even they had not the courage to ſay*, Let this mans blood be upon us and our Children.

This, MADAM, *is our condition: A condition, though, according to the World's eſtimation, to be bewailed, yet if we look up to Heaven, it is a condition to be triumphed in. Now we are ſure a reward in* Heaven *expects us, ſince we are thus recompenced upon* Earth. *It becomes us all therefore, bending the Knees of our Hearts, to give infinite thanks to our* gracious God, *ſince it is now evidently and confeſſedly for* him *onely, and the* Catholic verities *revealed by* him, *for the* unity *of his* Myſtical Body *and the religious fear we have of being guilty of* Schiſm, *that we do, and ſhall hereafter ſuffer.* This,

This, Madam, *is now our onely crime, and this I am now actually committing, and am so far from being asham'd* [*except only of the imperfect manner of executing it*] *that I have assumed the boldness to desire and hope your* Majesties *approbation and* defence *both of the* crime *and* criminal Person: *it is our whole* common Faith, delivered by God to the Church, *that both* at Court, *and* all over the Nation, *has been* publickly traduced; *some* Doctrins *have been charged to be* contrary to the honour and safety of the State; *others to be* Doctrins of Devils; *all of them to be* Novelties *and* usurpations; *our whole* Catholic Church *is made to pass for a* Sect, *a separated* Schismatical congregation; *But from what other* Church, *neither can our* Accuser *tell, nor any one imagin.*

Perhaps the present temper of the Times, and delay of an Adversary appearing, had encouraged the Preacher *to think his* Sermon *un-answerable, not for any weight in his proofs, but, because it may be in his power to reply with an* Instrument *sharper than his* Pen. *Notwithstanding, as* Prudence *did justly restrain that impetuosity, which* zeal *to*

Gods

Gods *truth might move in the hearts of* Catholics *to retort this* Cartel of Defiance, *which he has publiſhed againſt* His Church: *ſo to remain utterly ſilent after ſo many* re-impreſsions *of that* Sermon *in ſeveral forms and after ſuch diligent* Tranſlations *of it into* forraign Languages, *after that incredible avidity with which ſo many thouſand* Copies *of it have been ſnatched out of the hands of the Readers, and from the Stalls of the Sellers, this would be a confeſsion of our own guilt, and a diſtruſt in our Cauſe, as publick as his challenge and provocation has been, this would be indeed to be* aſhamed of Chriſt *and his truth* before men.

For this reaſon, ſhutting my eyes to all external frights or diſcouragements, I preſumed to undertake an Anſwer *to his* Allegations, *hoping that ſome others of my Brethren would do it with greater efficacy and fruit, than I dare promiſe to this imperfect work: And having this reſolution, I took the boldneſs to inſcribe* your Majeſties Name *in the Front, being aſſured that nothing could be more acceptable, nor a greater refreſhment to* your *moſt tenderly* Chriſtian heart, *(which bears an equal ſhare in this our common oppreſſion) then*

then to see that Faith, *which you valew above* Crowns, *at least not betray'd, and, truly I confidently hope, demonstrated to remain unprejudiced by any thing alledged in that* Sermon. *With this perswasion, I most humbly beg leave to cast at your* Majesties *feet both* my self *and* Work, *which, as it was undertaken, not upon my own single judgment, so that it may not appear in public, without your* Majesties approbation *and* protection, *is the most humble* Suit *and only Petition of,*

MADAM,

14 May, 1663.

Your MAIESTIES

Most humbly Devoted

Servant

in our Lord,

S. C.

CHAP. I.

Of Doctor Pierce's Sermon *in General: What was probably the inward design of it.*



Cannot forbid my self to wonder that a Book so universally esteem'd, so often reprinted, and not only reprinted in our own, but translated into foreign Languages, should yet lye open to so many and so plain Exceptions: Not one period can I find that seems to me Extraordinary; Not one Instance but has long since been often objected both with closer Reason and neater Rhetorick: So that now by experience, as well as faith, I see 'tis true that the Scripture sayes, *The Race is not to the Wise, nor the* Eccles. 9. *Battle to the Strong, nor favour to men*

of Skill, but Time and Chance happens to them all.

2. And are we not come to a fine paſſe, when not onely a dozen perhaps of the greateſt and ſubtileſt Controverſies in Religion ſhall be crowded into a ſhort Sermon; but expreſt with ſuch vanity and affectation of exotic and abſtruſe Phraſes, as if the end of Preaching were nothing but to talk an hour of hard things in harder words? Ask the great Auditory of *Lords* and *Ladies*, that heard this *Doctor* (Perſons of clear and ingenuous apprehenſions, who like good ſenſe, though not delivered in Greek, who penetrate into the connection of Things, though they have not miſ-ſpent their lives in ſtudying Words) Ask that Illuſtrious and Noble Aſſembly, what they think of the ἑνωτικὸν of the Emperor *Zeno*; or of the itching to be as old as the *Julian period* begun before the *Protoplaſt*. Some of them perhaps may have heard of the *Palladium* of the Conclave; but for the Embroidery of the *Theopneuſt Aholiab*, or the Antiquaryes *Keimeliah*, I believe the Ladies at leaſt, were a little puzled on the ſudden how to underſtand them; yet if thoſe pompous Sounds were tranſlated into plain Engliſh, not one of them but would eaſily ſee the ſenſe, without other Dictionary than their own Cabinet.

3. As for the *Doctor*'s profeſſion in his Epiſtle Dedicatory, *That his Reſolution was, the*

the Sermon ſhould never have been expos'd to the World, had not his Majeſty commanded it. I readily beleeve him; for a Victory is eaſily and very cheaply got, if a *Controverſie* be to be decided by a flouriſhing Speech, confidently pronounc'd by a Perſon in eſteem for Learning and Sincerity, in a Place where none muſt contradict, eſpecially when he proteſts *he has Proofs unqueſtionable* for all his Aſſertions. But till thoſe Proofs be examin'd, the Conqueſt is only over the Hearer's *paſſions* not their *reaſon*: It may be, (and I pray God this *Sermon* was not meant ſo) a good preparation to uſher in the *Calviniſtical zeal* for executing ſeverities on innocent Perſons, who ſincerely abhor the crimes deſerving ſuch Rigors, and the unchriſtian Principles, the Fountains of thoſe Crimes: that is, on Perſons againſt whom the *Law-givers* themſelves have publickly profeſſed they never intended thoſe puniſhments. This kind of Iuſtice he may hope for from his Sermon, but a rational conviction will never be the effect of it.

4. Truly *Doctor Pierce* muſt not blame us, if we fear he had ſome ſuch thoughts in his mind, when he preached this *Sermon*, ſo differing from the ſtyle of *Court-Sermons* in the times of his *Majeſty* of glorious memory, and of the late (as he ſtyles him) *immortal Archbiſhop*. But have we ſince thoſe dayes deſerved ſuch a change in the Tongues and Pens of any *Proteſtants*, eſpecially the Clergy?

By what crimes? Is it becauſe we have ever ſince been ready, and are ſo ſtill, unanimouſly to ſacrifice our Blood and Fortunes for *his Majeſty*, by which alſo their Church hath been maintained and ſetled againſt all the irreconcileable enemies both of Monarchy and It? Methinks they might forgive us this fault, both for paſt and future: For we ſhall fall into it again, if they do not take care, by deſtroying us, to prevent it.

5. This ſuſpition of ours is much encreaſed, when we reflect on that bitter paſſage in his *Epiſtle Dedicatory*, where he ſayes, *I ſuppoſe my diſcourſe, however innocent in it ſelf, will yet be likely to meet with many, not only learned and ſubtile, but reſtleſs Enemies; men of pleaſant inſinuations, and very plauſible ſnares; nay ſuch as are apt, where they have power, to confute their Opponents with fire and faggots.*

Indeed it is poſſible his *Sermon* may ſomewhere *fall into ſome ſuch hands*: But, unleſſe he will renounce all Charity, juſtice and humanity, he muſt not impute particular mens actions to *Catholic Religion*, and, for their faults, expoſe us to the common hatred and violence. Let all the received *Canons* of the Church be ſearched, and if one be found that juſtifies the ſhedding of blood ſimply on the account of Religion, he may have ſome pretence for ſuch an indefinite odious reflexion upon innocent ſuffering Chriſtians.

Let

Let all the practiſes of the World be examined, and it will clearly appear, 'tis not *Catholick Religion* that's chargable with theſe Exceſſes, ſince in ſo many places both they are not, where it is; and are, where it is not.

And, though for ſome few of theſe later Ages, the Civil Magiſtrates of ſome Countries have exercis'd a greater ſeverity, then antiently was us'd; Yet now even they have entertain'd a more calm and tractable Spirit, and ſeem to hope by other Arguments ſufficiently to ſecure their Religion. However, why muſt our *England* imitate the rigideſt of other Nations, againſt whom, for that very reaſon, we ſo loudly exclaim; rather than the moderate proceedings of thoſe, who are nearer us both in ſcituation, temper, and intereſt? Why thus continually be harping upon one ſtring that jarres, and never touch the reſt that move in harmony?

6. Our late unhappy wars have made the *Preacher* and many others beſides him *Travellers*; We appeal to their conſciences and experience, if they would be pleaſed to ſpeak, as Perſons of honour and integrity; Did they in any Catholick Countries, even *ROME* it ſelf (though here much ſpoken againſt for cruelty) ever apprehend any danger for their opinions, or refuſal to joyn in the exerciſe of *Catholick Religion?* ſo they would abſtain from publick ſcandalous affronts to the Church, they had freedom not

only with all quietneſſe to enjoy their conſciences, but civilly to juſtifie their Doctrines. All expreſſions of kindneſſe, tenderneſſe and compaſſion they received from their *Catholick* Opponents, but ſurely not the leaſt hard uſage that might imprint terrour in their minds.

7. Thus much may be permitted us to alledge in our own Defence upon this occaſion given us by the *Preacher*; eſpecially, conſidering we are the onely perſons expos'd to the publick hatred and rigour, though we onely, of all the Diſſenters from the Religion of the Kingdom, leaſt deſerve it: For, we are no Innovators, but Profeſſors of the ſame Religion that made this Nation *Chriſtian*. A Religion, though now too generally decryed, yet in thoſe times confirmed by great Miracles, as even Proteſtants acknowledge: A Religion, which for almoſt a thouſand years was onely known and profeſſed here. When the *Reformation* entred, though almoſt all Subjects were *Catholicks*, yet ſeeing the change was introduc'd by a Supream Authority, no oppoſition was made to it by any other *Armes*, but *Prayers* and *Tears*: Whatſoever *Treaſons* have been acted by a few wretched perſons, even our Princes themſelves have acquitted the generality of *Catholicks* thereof, and our Religion from allowing them. There cannot be framed any *Formes* of profeſſing or acknowledg-

ing

ing due *Supremacy* and *Allegiance* to our *Kings*, but we are ready to ſubſcribe them in the ſame ſenſe that the moſt learned *Proteſtants* themſelves ordinarily ſay they intend them. Publick atteſtations of our fidelity and zeal, in ſerving and defending our Princes, and even the Religion of the Kingdom (almoſt deſtroy'd by a *Conſpiracy* of all other *Diſſenters*) have been made in our behalf, even by ſome, who now are moſt ſharp againſt us: Yet after all this, of them who are not able to alledge any one of theſe excuſes for themſelves ſome are rendred in a capacity to Triumph over our Suffrings; unrepentant Traytors are among our Accuſers; though it is known, the thing which moſt enrages them, is our fidelity; their Invectives, how falſe ſoever, are believ'd, and they hope to become popular for their attempts to deſtroy us.

CHAP. II.

Eleven Novelties charged on Catholics.

Schism *imputed to* Catholics.

Why neceſſary the Sermon *ſhould be refuted by* Catholics.

The Anſwerers *proteſtation of ſincerity.*

1. THe *Doctours Sermon*, for as much as concerns us *Roman Catholicks*, pretends a double Deſign. *Firſt*, Confidently enough to aſſert that the Doctrines in which we differ are on our parts meer *Novelties*, and that *Primitive Antiquity* both of *Scripture* and *the four firſt General Councils* ſtands clearly for *Proteſtants*. *Secondly*, In conſequence to this, that not *they*, but the *Roman* Church alone is guilty of *Schiſm*.

2. As to the firſt Part he exemplyfies in theſe following Points of *Catholick Doctrine*, which he ſaies are *Novelties*, and undertakes to calculate the preciſe time of their Nativity. 1. *The Supremacy of the Pope.* 2. *The infallibility*

infallibility of the Church. 3. *Purgatory.* 4. *Tranſubſtantiation.* 5. *The Sacrifice of the Maſſe.* 6. *Communion under one Species.* 7. *Worſhip of Images.* 8. *The Scriptures and publick Divine Service in an unknown Tongue.* 9. *Invocation of Saints.* 10. *The forbidding Mariage to Perſons in holy Orders.* 11. *The allowing Divorce for other cauſes beſides Fornication.*

3. Then concerning the other part of his general Deſign about *Schiſm*, he acknowledges that a real *Schiſm* there is, but that the *cauſe* of it came from the *Roman Church*, which made erroneous *Novelties*, *new Articles of their Creed*, which errours the Reformers were oblig'd in conſcience to reject, and reject them they did by warrantable and *legal* Authority: So that though they ſeparated from the then preſent viſible *Church*, yet they ought not to be called *Schiſmatics*, but that Church is to be eſteemed *Schiſmatical*, which cauſed them to ſeparate.

4. This is in groſſe the ſubſtance of what in his *Sermon* he alledges againſt Her, that heretofore was this Churches *Mother*, and a great proportion of whoſe kindneſſe ſhe ſtill enjoyes, the *Roman Catholick Church*. Now conſidering with what triumphing applauſes this *Sermon* was heard, and with what a general greedineſſe thouſands of the printed Copies have been bought up, even by thoſe that formerly have not been curiouſly inquiſitive

fitive after *Court Sermons* for any good they meant the *Preachers*. Would not Proteſtants themſelves in their hearts condemn *Roman Catholicks*, if, being confidently perſwaded, (as truly for my part I am) that there is not ſo much as one ſingle allegation among all his repleniſh'd *Margins* that reaches home to a concluding proof of what he pretends to, they ſhould out of a treacherous fearfulneſſe be utterly ſilent, as acknowledging that now they have a proſtrated cauſe. And therefore if it be but onely out of fear of loſing their good opinion, ſomthing muſt be ſaid by us to acquaint him with his miſtakes.

5. Now in my *Remarks* upon this *Sermon*, I will follow his own order before ſummarily ſet down: And both in the Points of *Doctrine* and *Schiſm* I will ſelect his *Arguments*, adjoining to each Point reſpectively, the *Quotations* or Authorities of Fathers related to in the Margins: And having done this, I will ſincerely diſcover the grounds upon which I think I can Demonſtrate, That he has neither rationally concluded any of our *Catholick Doctrines* to have been *Novelties*, nor freed his own *Church* from the juſt imputation of *Schiſm*.

6. And, knowing very well what candor, ſincerity and charity *Almighty God* requires from thoſe who undertake *his* cauſe, and the cauſe of his *Church*; I do here call Him as a witneſſe upon my Soul, that my purpoſe is ſtudiouſly

ſtudiouſly to avoid all cavilling diſtorſions either of *Texts* of *Scriptures*, or the holy *Fathers*, and much more thoſe falſly called *pias fraudes*, corruptions of either: And both in my Anſwers and Objections, I will alledge nothing but what I am perſwaded is both pertinent and efficacious to conclude that for which it is produced, that is, I will bring nothing as a proof, which I for the preſent think can be anſwered.

7. I am inform'd that he in his *Sermon* made the like *Proteſtation*. If he did, I am very glad for his own ſake, that he forbore to print, what he then ſpoke: becauſe though I muſt not charge him with wilful ſincerity, yet I believe he will find by this ſhort Paper, that he did neglect to make uſe of his beſt judgement and caution, which certainly, if ever, was moſt requiſite, in a cauſe ſo important, eſpecially it being to be debated by one that profeſſed to ſupply the place of God himſelf in his own Houſe, and who ſpoke to no meaner Perſon than the KING, *God's own Vicegerent*.

8. But whether the *Preacher* in his *Sermon*, the ſubject whereof was nothing but Controverſies, and ſuch as his Text neither invited, much leſſe compelled him to undertake, or however to debate them with ſuch Invectives and exulcerating digreſſions whether I ſay, herein he expreſſed that reſpect and duty he owed his *Majeſty*, that is, whether ſuch

ſuch a diſtemper'd *Sermon* was conformable to the *Injunctions* touching *Preaching*, which *his Majeſty* had lately commanded my *Lord Archbiſhop* to communicate to the Clergy, I leave to the *Preachers* own Conſcience. If he reſolved to tranſgreſſe thoſe Orders ſo becomming a Prince who lov'd the peace of his Kingdoms, and ſtill feels ſo much by their diſunions in Opinions: yet in reaſon he might have abſtained from letting the Court and Kingdom ſee, that he had the courage to diſobey the *King* to his own face: The Univerſity-pulpit, or ſome City Congregations, where ſuch behaviour is in faſhion, might well enough have contented him.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Biſhop Jewel's *Challenge imitated by* Doctor Pierce.

Primitive Reformers acknowledge Antiquity to ſtand for Catholics.

The Doctor's notion of Beginning: *He is obliged thereto by an Act of Parliament*, 5 Eliz.

Five Queſtions propoſed touching that Notion.

1. WHat *ground* or motive the *Preacher* had to renew the vain brag of *Biſhop Jewel*, derided by his *Adverſaries*, and condemned by his *Brethren*, it will be leſſe difficult for us to imagin, than for himſelf ſincerely to acknowledge. However, that, both that *Biſhop* and *He* are ſingular in this matter of challenging the concurrence of Antiquity for themſelves, and imputing *Novelty* to the *Catholic Church*, we have a *cloud of Witneſſes* among the firſt *Reformers*, both in groſſe and by retayl, through all the par-

particular Points by him mentioned.

2. In general let him consider what *Melanchthon* writes: *Presently from the beginning of the Church, the antient Fathers obscured the doctrine concerning the justice of Faith, encreased Ceremonies and devised peculiar Worships.* In like manner *Peter Martyr* affirms, *That in the Church errours did begin immediately after the Apostles times: And that presently after their Age men began to decline from the Word of God: And therefore so long as we insist upon Councils and Fathers, we shall alwayes be conversant in the same errours.* In so much as *Beza* had the arrogance to write thus in an Epistle: *I have said more than once, and I suppose not without reason, that comparing the antient times of the Church, even those immediately succeeding the Apostles with ours, they had better Consciences, but lesse Knowledge: On the contrary, We have more Knowledge, but lesse Conscience. This is my Judgement, &c.* These are esteem'd as learned Writers as the *Reformation* had; They spent their lives in reading and examining Antiquity, and were as willing to make it speak on their sides, as the *Preacher* was: But as *ill Consciences* as they had, they were convinced and forced publickly to confess that the *Fathers* were against them, and for us.

Melanct. in 1 Cor. 3.

Pet. Mart. 1. devotis. p. 477. Id. ib. p. 490. Id. ib. p. 476.

Beza Epist. Tom. 1.

And in particular Opposition to his Claim of Antiquity, (like *Bishop Jewels* for the first six *Centuries*) *Doctor Fulk* is so far from

from concurring with him or *Bishop Jewel*, that he is so choleric at the suspition of such a charge, that he addresses himself to his Adversary in this civil language; *I Answer*, saies he, *if he charge me with confessing the continuing of the Church in incorruption for six hundred years next after Christ, he lyeth in his heart.* *Fulk* in Rejoynd. to *Brislow.* pag. 4.

3. One passage there is of that famous *Andreas Duditius*, which truly I cannot read without extream compassion and astonishment at the dreadful judgment of God, and it may do *Doctor Pierce* much good, if he sadly reflect on it. Many years he had lived in great esteem for learning and prudence, a *Catholick Bishop* of *Petschen* in *Hungary*, called *Quinque Ecclesiæ*; present he was at the framing the *Decrees* of the *Council of Trent*: But at last falling in love with a *Maid of honour* in the *Queen of Hungaries Court*, to marry her, he quitted both his *Bishoprick* and *Religion*. This poor man in his declining Age could not abstain from confessing in a *Letter* to *Beza* his unsatisfaction in his *new Religion*, vainly hoping some either *Cordial* or *Opiate* for his distressed Conscience, from one as deeply plunged, and by the very same motives engaged in the same change. I pray observe his words: [*Si veritas est*, saies he, *quam veteres Patres, &c.*] *If that be truth which the antient Fathers, by mutual consent have professed, it will entirely stand on the Papists side: For if heretofore* *Andre. Duditius in Epist. Theol. Beza.* 1.

any

any Controverſies out of a heat of Diſputation aroſe between the learned among them, an end was preſently impoſed thereto by Decrees of Councils or even of the Pope alone. But what ſtrange people have we among us? They are alwaies wandring, toſſ'd with every wind of Doctrine, and being hurried into the main Deep, they are carried ſometimes this way, ſometimes another. If you would inform your ſelf what their Judgment to day is touching Religion, you may perhaps come to know it: But what it will be to morrow on the ſame Argument, neither themſelves nor you can certainly affirm: Thus *Duditius.* And what *Cordial* againſt this ſcrupulous Melancholly does *Beza* his good friend afford him? Take it from himſelf: [*Scio ſpecioſum eſſe venerandæ vetuſtatis nomen, &c.*] *I know the name of venerable Antiquity is very ſpecious: But whence ſhall we fetch the beginning of that Title, but from the Prophets and Apoſtles? For, as for Writers that come after them, if we will take their own advice, we will believe them on no other terms but as far as they ſhall evidently make good what they deliver, out of the Holy Scriptures:* That is in effect, have but the Chriſtian modeſty and humility to prefer your own ſenſe of *Scriptures* before all the *Fathers* and *Councils of Gods Church*, and then nothing, they ſay, need to trouble you: *Antiquity, venerable Antiquity* will be on your ſide: You may confidently ſay of all your *Adverſaries Doctrine, From the Beginning it was not ſo.*

Ibid.

4. Many

4. Many other *Confeſsions* of the like nature might be added: but for brevity-ſake I will content my ſelf with onely one more, and that is (as it ſeems to me) a ſecret acknowledgement of the *Church* of *England* in her publick Liturgy, directly contrary to the *Preachers* pretenſion and applications of his Text, by which ſhe, after a ſort, imputes *Novelty* to her ſelf, and confeſſes the *Roman* to be that Church which was *from the beginning*. In the Order for Morning-prayer there are theſe Verſicles and Reſponds.

Common-Prayer-book.

V. *O Lord ſave the King.*

R. *And mercifully hear us when we call upon thee.*

V. *Endue thy Miniſters with righteouſneſs.*

R. *And make thy choſen people joyfull.*

V. *O Lord ſave thy People.*

R. *And bleſs thine Inheritance.*

Then follows a *Verſicle* for *Peace*. Now theſe, as almoſt all the other *Prayers*, are maſeſtly tranſlated out of the *Roman Office*. But that which ought to be obſerved, is, That in the *Roman Office* there is a *Verſicle* and *Reſpond* immediately following theſe, and going before the *Verſicle* for *Peace*, which the *Engliſh Church* has ſtudiouſly left out; and that is this,

V. *Be mindfull of thy Congregation (O Lord.)*

Memento congregationis tuæ Domine quam poſſediſti AB INITIO.

R. *Which thou didſt poſſeſs from the beginning.*

Now the ground why this ſpecial *Verſicle* or Prayer for the *Church* was left out, is not ſo myſterious, but it may be very probably gueſs'd at.

The *firſt Reformers* did not love to put God in mind of that *Church* which was *from the beginning*: Or rather they were deſirous the People ſhould forget the *Church* which was *from the beginning*: They had rather no Prayers at all ſhould be made for the *Church*, than for one that was *from the beginning*, becauſe apparently that could not be the *Reformed Church of England*, whoſe *beginning* themſelves ſaw.

5. Notwithſtanding ſuch plain Confeſſions of theſe Pillars of *Reformation*, yet the *Doctor* confidently ſtands (with a little contraction and abatement) to *Biſhop Jewel's* Challenge: He indeed mentions 27. Points, of which 22. are about circumſtantial matters touching the *Euchariſt*, and two more of them [*viz.* 1. That Ignorance is the Mother and Cauſe of true Devotion and Obedience. 2. And that the Lay-people (if he ſpeaks of them in general) are forbidden to read the Word of God in their own tongue,] are Calumnies. The other are three indeed of the Preacher's points, *viz.* 1. *Supremacy of the Pope*. 2. *Worſhip of Images*. 3. *Common-prayers in a ſtrange tongue*, though the only fault he can find in this laſt, is, That the later Church hath adhered too cloſe to Antiquity,

tiquity; that she hath not varied in the language of her Devotions from her Predecessors; and, after *A. D.* 600. continued to say her Prayers in the same Language she did before. But then this *Bishop*, (as being somewhat better experienc'd in Antiquity than *Doctor Pierce*) had not the confidence in this his Catalogue to reckon as Novelties either the *Infallability of the Church*, *Invocation of Saints*, *Purgatory*, or *Prayer for the Dead*, *Celibacy of the Clergy*, or *Sacrifice of the Mass*. So much more courage had the *Preacher* than even *Bishop Jewel* himself. Well, between both, all *antiquity* is for them, and nothing but *novelty* on our side. No doubt but his admiring and believing *Hearers* assured themselves that some never-before-examined Witnesses, some hitherto unknown or un-observed *Records* had been found out by their learned and confident *Preacher*, to justifie their deserted claim of Antiquity, I mean by way of aggression, and not simple defence. But when the *Sermon* is publish'd, nothing appears in the *Text* or *Margins*, but Assertions and *Quotations* an hundred times before produced, and as often silenced, many of which too (as he explains them) have no regard to the publick received *Doctrin* of the *Catholic Church*, but particular Opinions of some *Catholic Divines*, as much disputed against by other *Catholics* as by *Protestants*.

6. However to qualifie a little the admira-

tion that many *Proteſtants* have of their *new Champion*, or *Hyperaſpiſta*, as he calls it, ſomthing muſt be ſaid thi› hundred and one time to old allegations and new miſtakes. And firſt, whereas in all points now in debate between us, he ſo often repeats, *From the Beginning it was not ſo*; He did very well to fix a notion and conception of this word *Beginning*, or a diſtinct meaſure of time after which only whatever *Doctrine* are broached, ought in his opinion, to be eſteemed *Novelties*; *Novelties* of ſo great importance, as to juſtifie a ſeparation from the *external communion* of all *Churches* both *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern*. And that is the time of the *Apoſtles*, and ſo downward, till the *fourth General Council incluſively*: This he has don not out of a voluntary liberality, but becauſe *an Act of Parliament* obliges him, wherein it is ſaid: *That ſuch Perſons, (Laicks or Eccleſiaſticks) to whom Queen* Elizabeth *ſhall, by Letters patents under the great Seal of* England, *give authority to execute any Juriſdiction ſpiritual, or to correct any Errors, Hereſies, Schiſms, &c. ſhall not in any wiſe have authority to adjudge any matter or cauſ to be Hereſy, but only ſuch as heretofore have been determined to be Hereſy by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or by the firſt four General Councils, or any of them, or by any other General Council, wherein the ſame was declared Hereſy by the expreſs and plain words of the ſaid Canonical Scriptures, or ſuch as hereafter ſhall be*

Stat 1 Eliz.

judged

judged to be Heresy by the High Court of Parliament with the assent of the Clergy in their Convocation.

7. By this *Proviso* it appears, that, though in words the *Doctor* is more liberal to us than the *Presbyterians* and other *Sects*, who will call all things *Novelties*, which they think are not in *express Scripture*, yet the *Law* would have allow'd him a greater extent, for he might have enlarg'd the time beyond the *four first General Councils* to any succeeding Council, that (in the Opinion of *Commissioners*) judged *Heresy* by *express Scripture*, or to future *Acts of Parliament*, judging after the same manner: but we are content with, and thank him for his allowance.

8. Only he must give us leave to propound a few *Questions* upon this occasion; As first, Does he submit only to the *four first General Councils*, because they had an Authority inherent in them obliging him thereto? Or because he judged their *Decisions* conformable to God's express word? If the *former*, then he must inform us, why only *four Councils* have such authority, which it seems the Church lost as soon as the *Fathers* at *Chalcedon* rose? If the *later*, then he deludes us, and with *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, *Quakers*, &c. makes *Scripture* alone in effect the *Rule* of Reformation, and *Protestants* only the *Interpreters* of that Rule: Because the *Statute* tyes no further to any *General Council*, than as *Quest.* 1.

that *Council* is believ'd to proceed according to *expreſs Scripture*: which, whether it does or no, who muſt be Judge, *Doctor Pierce?* To anſwer this Queſtion well will be a great Maſter-piece: I am ſure his late *immortal Archbiſhop* found it a Task too hard for himſelf, as ſhall be ſeen before we part: *too hard* I ſay to reſolve ſo, that any rational man can be ſatisfied with.

Queſt. 2. 9. A *ſecond Queſtion* is, Whether to judge of *Hereſy*, that is to determin authoritatively what is *Hereſy*, and what is conformable to *Scripture*, be not an Act of *Juriſdiction purely Spiritual* and *Paſtoral?* (though it ſeems to reſide notwithſtanding ſometimes in Lay-Commiſſioners, but ordinarily in the *Parliament*) And this not being poſſible to be denyed, then he muſt be further ask'd, ſince by one of the 39. *Articles* it is affirmed, That *General Councils may and have err'd*, whether the *Engliſh judge of Hereſy* (be it the King, as in the days of *Henry* the 8th and *Edw.* the 6th. or the *Parliament alſo*, as in *Queen Elizabeths*) be *infallible* or no? If he acknowledge it *infallible*, he muſt reſolve us, whether the *Supreme Temporal Authority*, with the aſſent of the *Clergy* be *infallible* only in *England*, or in other Countrys alſo as *Holland*, *Swedland?* &c. If the *former*, he muſt ſhew what Promiſes our *Lord* has made to *England* alone. If the *later*, then it will follow that that may, and certainly will be *Hereſy*,

resy and contrary to *Scripture* in *England*, which *England* it self confesses is not *Heresy* beyond Sea. But if no such *Authority* be indeed *infallible*, then it will follow, that *Decisions*, made by it, do not oblige in Conscience: and by consequence in his Opinion there is no *Spiritual Authority* on earth that does so, I mean oblige, not only to *non-contradiction*, but to *internal assent*. The consequences of which *Position* he may imagin, and shal see anon.

10. A *third Question* is, Whether since *Quest.* 3. *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, and all such *Reformed* Churches, following the Heresy of *Aerius*, do directly oppose the *Order of Bishops* and their *Jurisdiction*, (that is, the whole frame of God's Church) manifestly asserted in the *four first General Councils*, and as is here affirmed, of *Divine Right* by expresse Scripture; whether, I say, they be not, according to this *Rule* formal *Heretics*, or however *Schismatics*; since to alter this Frame, they relinquish'd both this Church and ours? And especally for their denying the Supream *Ecclesiastical*, or *Spiritual Authority*, to be in *Temporal Governors*, which yet the *Statute* tells us, in effect, is the fundamental Corner-stone of the *English Church*? If all this do not render them *Heretics*, or at least in the highest degree *Schismatics*, what will become of this *Act of Parliament*, and his *Primitive Rule of Reformation*? If they be such, what will

become of the *English Church*, which gives to *Heretics* and *Schismatics* the right-hand of Fellowship, and acknowledges them *holy Christian-Reformed Congregations*? And on the other side, since, notwithstanding the extremity of passion against *Catholics*, it was never yet pronounced that *Roman Catholics* are *Heretics*, nor possibly could by their own *Rule* and *measure*; how comes it to passe that we alone are punish'd with *death* as *Heretics*, and this meerly for *Religion* since we both often have justified and still are ready to justifie our Principles of *Fidelity* and *Peaceableness* beyond all exception; which yet no other *Dissenters* from this Church, though real *Heretics* and *Schismatics*, either have, or I fear will do?

Quest. 4. 10. A *fourth Question* shall be, How can the *Preacher* answer to God for abusing *Scripture*, and mis-applying, through the whole *Sermon*, his *Text*, to the *prejudice* of his *Church*? He pretends that our *Saviour's* words are to be esteem'd the *Pattern*, or *Primitive Rule of Reformation*, and consequently, as our Lord demonstrated Pharisaical Divorces to be illegal, because *Ab initio non fuit sic*: So the *Doctor* pretends to prove the Justice and Legality of the English Reformation, because, by the like examination, he finds that *Roman Doctrine* are *Novelties*, and that *Ab initio non fuit sic*; Therefore they, as Jewish Divorces, are to be abolished,

abolished, and that only to be confirmed, which God instituted from the *Beginning*. But he little considers that our *Saviours* saying, *It was not so*, signifies, *It was directly contrary to SO*, as if he said, You allow Divorces, *ob quamcunque causam*, in manifest opposition to God's Ordinance from the Beginning, who said, *Whomsoever God hath joyn'd, let no man put asunder*: This is therefore a Novelty necessary to be reform'd. Now, if the *Preacher* would have made use of this, indeed, perfect *Primive Rule of Reformation*, he by his *Text* was obliged to have produced from the *Beginning*, that is either in Scriptures, or in the Fathers within the *four first General Councils*, some expresse Authorities and *Decisions* directly contrary to *Roman Doctrines*, which he calls *Novelties*: He ought to have quoted out of Holy Scriptures, or some Councils or consent of Fathers, such sayings as these: 1. *St.* Peter *and his Successors never had nor ought to have any Supremacy of Jurisdiction.* 2. *The whole Church is a fallible Guide, not to be relyed upon against our private sence of God's Word.* 3. *There is no state after death in which Souls may find refreshment by the prayers of the living.* 4. *The Body of Christ is not substantially present on the Altar.* 5. *There is no true Christian Sacrifice.* 6. *Both Elements are essential to the Sacrament.* 7. *All respect to Images is forbidden.* 8. *Invocation of Saints is unlawful.* 9. *The Scriptures must be given into all*

mens

mens hands, without any certain guide to interpret them. 10. *Prayers not in a vulgar tongue, though interpreted, are abominable.* 11. *To forbid the use of Marriage to Priests is a Doctrine of Devils.* 12. *To separate Bed and Board among maried persons, though when, without danger of their lives, they cannot live together, is a practice condemn'd by our Lord.* And after all, 13. *To break the visible unity of God's Church, for Doctrines and Practises not in themselves causing Damnation, but onely said to be false, is the Duty of every good Christian.* Such sayings as these had been to some purpose, they would have been pertinent to his Text; But no such appear. On the contrary, it serves his turn to say again and again, *From the Beginning it was not so: This is the burthen of his Song*: If he can shew that, because this is the first time, we hear or read such a Doctrine (mentioned in any Ecclesiastical writer) as *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *&c.* therefore it is a *Novelty*, it was never in the Church before, he sales something to the purpose.

But, let me ask him, was there no Doctrine at all in the Church before it was written? Or was there no Doctrine in the Church but what was written? And again, is all that's written in any Age still Extant, and come to our hands? Or do those Fathers, who first writ it, say, That they, or their times first introduc'd it? No: On the contrary, they expresly declaim against *Innovations*,

vations, Novelties is their *Prescription* against all *Heresies*; So that for them to bring into the Church any Doctrines not heard of, or not received before, had been to profess themselves *Hereticks*, and there would not have wanted other Fathers that would have condemned such Innovations: Which yet was never done to *Origen* or *Tertullian*, &c, for any Doctrines mentioned by the Preacher: Whereas for other Errors they were sufficiently proscribed. From whence 'tis evident, that, through the whole *Sermon* there is a palpable misapplication of the *Text*, and that the *Preacher* has been injurious to our *Saviour*, in making his just condemnation of the *Pharisees*, a warrant for him unjustly to condemn his Church. Indeed, in all matters left indifferent, and no way commanded from the beginning, nor contrary to any Divine Revelation, the Church of later times may vary, as she thinks fit, either from the practice, or injunctions of the former: For example, supposing *Celibacy* of the Clergy, (the 7th. Point the Doctor instances in) had not been practised or mentioned from the beginning; yet, if God had not commanded the contrary, and the thing in it self be feasible (of which more anon) the Church of a later Age may lawfully enjoyn it: The Rule therefore holds only for matters of Faith and Divine Revelation. In which 'tis true, That the Later times may

not

not vary from the former; But yet, neither doth the Rule hold in these, as to the *expresse terms* of every Proposition that is matter of Faith, but only as to the sense and substance. It is not necessary that *ab initio*, God the Son should be declared in expresse terms *Consubstantial* with the Father, which was first put into the Christians Creed by the Council of *Nice*: But only that that Doctrine can be shewed *ab initio*, which is identified in sense with this: Nor can I think the *Doctor*, upon second considerations, will offer to gainsay so plain a truth.

But it is now time to Examin the particular Points which he charges on the Church as *Novelties*, and of each of which *he* saies as unwarrantably, as *our Lord*, against the *Jewish Innovations* said justly, *From the beginning it was not so.*

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The ſum of Dr. Pierce's *Diſcourſe againſt the* Pope's Supremacy *enervated by himſelf. The Churches Doctrin touching that Supremacy. The Text,* Mark 10.42. *cleared.*

1. IN the *Doctor's* Catalogue of *Roman Novelties*, the *firſt* is, The *Supremacy of the Pope: Concerning which*, he tells his *Majeſtie, he has ſpoken moſt at large, becauſe it is a Point wherein the honour and ſafety of his Dominions are moſt concern'd; And becauſe, by* Bellarmin's *Aſſertion, it is the chief, if not onely hinge on which does hang the whole ſtreſſe of the Papal Fabrick.* Epiſt. Dedicat.

This *univerſal Superintendency or Supremacy of the Pope* (ſaith he) *hath been a viſible uſurpation ever ſince* Boniface *the* 3*d. to whom it was ſold by the moſt exetrable* Phocas, *the greateſt Villain in the world, except* Cromwel *and* Pontius Pilate, *not out of reverence to the Pope, but in diſpleaſure* Serm. pag. 10. Page 16.

to

to Cyriacus, *Patriark of* Conſtantinople, &c.

2, In contradiction to this Uſurpation, he

Page 17. adds, *But from the beginning it was not ſo. For we find in Scripture the Apoſtles were equally foundations of the wall of God's City,* &c. *They were all*

Page 18. *as St.* Cyprian *ſaies,* Pari conſortio præditi & honoris, & poteſtatis: *And S.* Hierom *is as expreſſe: And ſure* Paul, *who withſtood* Peter *to his face, was equal to him at the leaſt. And for any one Biſhop to affect over his Brethren a Supremacy of Power and Juriſdiction is a moſt impudent oppoſition both to the Letter and Senſe of our* Saviour's *precept,* Mark 10. 42, 43, 44. They that rule over the Gentiles exerciſe Lordſhip over them, &c. But ſo ſhall it not be among you, but whoſoever, &c. *Nay, by the Canons*

Ibid. *of the two firſt General Councils, every Patriark and Biſhop is appointed to be chief in his proper Dioceſſe, as the Biſhop of Rome is the chief in his. And a ſtrict Injunction is laid on all, the Biſhop of* Rome *not excepted, that they preſume not to meddle*

Page 19. *in any Dioceſſe but their own. And the chief Primacies of Order were granted to* Rome *and* Conſtantinople, *not for having been the Sees of ſuch and ſuch an Apoſtle, but for being the two Seats of the two great Empires: Witneſſe the famous Canon of the General Council of* Chalcedon, &c. *Nay, the immediate Predeceſſor of* Boniface *the*

Ibid. *third,* Pope Gregory *the Great, calls the* Title of Univerſal Biſhop, *a wicked, prophane, and blaſphemous Title, importing that the times of*

Antichriſt

Antichriſt were at hand, &c. Further adding, *That if any one Biſhop were univerſal, there would by conſequence be a failing of the univerſal Church, upon the failing of ſuch a Biſhop: Which is an Argument* ad homines, *not eaſily to be anſwer'd, whatſoever infirmity it may labour with in its ſelf*, &c. And upon that occaſion he makes an excurſion about the *Pope's infallibility*, and his falling into Hereſie, &c. nothing to the Point. Laſtly, He concludes, that *Whoſoever ſhall read at large the many Liberties of the Gallican Church, and the publiſhed confeſſions of Popiſh Writers for more then a thouſand years together, touching the Papal Uſurpations, and Right of Kings, he will not deny that the Supremacy of the Pope is but a proſperous Uſurpation.* Page 20. Page 21.

3. This is the ſubſtance of his Diſcourſe upon this Point of *Novelty*, the *Supremacy of the Pope*. In anſwering which he muſt permit me, yet without any prejudice to the Cauſe, yea rather for a better clearing of it, not to bind my ſelf to his Order: Aſſuring him, in the mean time, that I will not purpoſely omit any thing material, either in his Reaſoning or Quotations.

1. And firſt in general, he muſt give me leave to tell him, that by the Concluſion of the foregoing Diſcourſe, he has entirely enervated all that went before. For by arguing and aſſerting, *That the Gallican Liberties and Popiſh writings againſt Papal Uſurpations*

do

to demonstrate that the Supremacy of the Pope is but a prosperous Usurpation: He clearly shows that his fore-mentioned Reasons do not touch the Catholic Cause at all: He acknowledges those Writers to have been *Roman Catholics*: None can deny the *French Church* to be a Member of the *Roman Catholic Church*, acknowledged for such by the *Pope* himself, and professing a subjection to him, as to the Supream Spiritual Pastor of God's Church: Therefore it is evident that what they deny to the *Pope*, is not simply his *Supremacy in Spiritual* matters, (which is all that will be required of *Protestants*) but an extending of that *Supremacy* beyond what they conceive the received *Ecclesiastical Canons* do warrant: (and this the *English* may as well be permitted to do as the *French*.)

4. To the end therefore he may no longer mistake this so important an Argument, I will clearly set down the *Churches Doctrine* concerning this matter. This Doctrine is contained in that profession of Faith compiled by *Pius* 4. and extracted out of the *Council of Trent*. *I believe that the Pope is the Successor of St.* Peter, *and Vicar of Jesus Christ on Earth: I acknowledge the Holy Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church, as the Mother and Mistress of all other Churches.* And more largely in the *Decree*, with great circumspection framed in the *Council of Florence*, and subscribed by the *Greeks*. *We do define that the Holy Apostolick*

Sess. 25.

Concil. Floren.

postolic See and Bishop of Rome *does enjoy a Supremacy through the whole world; And that the same Bishop of* Rome *is the Successor of St.* Peter, *Prince of the Apostles, the true Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Head of the Universal Church; the Father and Teacher of all Christians; and that in the Person of St.* Peter *he hath received from our Lord Jesus Christ full power to feed, rule and govern the whole Church in such manner as is express'd in the Acts of Oecumenical Councils and the holy Canons.*

This is the *Decision* of the Council of *Florence*: The substance of the Doctrine of which Decree, (by which the *Pope*, as Successor of St. *Peter*, is acknowledg'd to have a Jurisdiction over all Christians, to be regulated by the *Ecclesiastical Canons*) is so received even in *France*, notwithstanding all the Gallican Liberties, that whoever denies it, will not be esteem'd a *Catholic*. See what Cardinal *Palavicino* writes touching the Cardinal of *Lorrain* and his *French Bishops* proceedings about this *Point* in the *Council* of *Trent*.

5. This Jurisdiction the Preacher positively denies both to the *Pope* and St. *Peter*, affirming *It to be an impudent opposition both to the Letter and sense of our Saviours forecited precept,* Page 17. *Mark* 10. But I heartily wish Dr. *Pierce* would look well on this passage of the Gospel once more, and ask his own reason, though he should not be able to exclude all the fumes of passion from it; Is Ecclesiastical

Authority in Superiors, and Subordination of Inferiors forbidden in this Text? Will one that calls himself *a Regular Son of the Church of England*, by vertue of this Text pronounce the Sentence of *Decapitation* (according to his own pleasant expression) upon his own Church, whosoever passes for the Head of it, whether his *Majesty*, or my *Lord of Canterbury*? On the contrary, I dare pronounce that (not the affecting, but) lawful exercising a *Supremacy* of *Power* and *Jurisdiction* is so far from being *an impudent opposition to this Precept*, that it is establish'd by it. For in this very *Text* expresse mention is made of some that are *great*, yea some that are the *chiefest*. And if he would have adjoyn'd the next Verse to his Quotation, he would have published to the most ignorant of his Hearers or Readers his manifest abusing this passage of Scripture: Our Saviour immediately adding, *For even the Son of man came not to be ministred unto, but to minister.* Surely he will not deny, but that our *Saviour* had Authority, yea a *Supremacy of Jurisdiction* over the Church, and only here proposes himself as a *Pattern* of humility to be imitated by his *Apostles* and their *Successors*. And what were the *Apostles*? *Church Governors*, without question. How then are they to imitate their *Supream Governor*? In renouncing *Superiority*? Did he himself do so? By no means. But as *he did not glorifie himself to be an High Priest*

Mark. 10. 45.

Hebr. 5. 5, 6.

Priest: *But he that said unto him thou art a Priest forever after the order of Melchisedech*: And being high Priest he did not forget his meekness and humility, consistent very well with the vigour of Spiritual Jurisdiction: In like manner his Apostles, (and all that succeed him) are commanded not to *affect* Superiority, and when they are lawfully invested with it, not to exercise it with such an arrogant pride as *Heathen Princes* usually do, ἐξουσίας κοσμικῆς τύφῳ. *Conc. Eph.* 1. *Can.* 8. they must neither φιλοπρωτεῖν, nor κατακυριεύειν; neither ambitiously seek Superiority; nor after a secular manner, *Lord it over the Flock of Christ*. 1 Pet. 5.

6. And now let the Doctor say where is *the impudent opposition of Supremacy and Jurisdiction both to the letter and sense of our Saviours Precept?* Such an Argument as this, being *Magisterially* and confidently pronounc'd, might for half an hour serve his present turn in the *Pulpit*: But I wonder he could have the confidence to expose it to examination in Print. 'Tis time we come a little closer to examine this his first great *Novelty*.

CHAP. V.

The Doctor *obliged to acknowledge Submiſsion due to the* Pope's Authority, *as exerciſed during the four General Councils. Of the Title of* Univerſal Biſhop. *It is not generally admitted at this day.*

1. HIs main Poſition in his forecited Diſcourſe on this Argument is: '*That* 'a *Supremacy of Juriſdiction challenged and* 'exerciſed *by the Pope, as Succeſſor of St.* Pe-'ter, *is a viſible uſurpation ever ſince* Boni-'face *the Third, to whom it was ſold by the Ty-'rant* Phocas: *that is, it began about the year* A. D. 606. 606. never before that time having been acknowledged in God's Church. To prove this, all the foregoing Reaſons and Allegations are produced by him: From this *uſurped Authority*, his *Engliſh Church* (forſooth) hath made a *Seceſſion*, as he demurely Phraſes it, and not from any Authority (if any were) exerciſed by former *Popes*, eſpecially during the

the times of the *four firſt General Councils*. *A Primacy of Order* he is content to allow him, but by no means *a Supremacy of Juriſdiction*.

2. Whatſoever *Authority* then the Predeceſſors of Pope *Boniface* the Third by conſent of other Churches enjoy'd, eſpecially till the end of the fourth *General Council*, he muſt grant is no uſurpation, and therefore a Legal rightful Authority, from which, without a formal Schiſm, they could not withdraw themſelves. He will not ſurely ſay with one of their learned Biſhops, *That they take from the* Pope *his lawful Chriſtian Authority, and give that (only) to the King, not his unlawful and Antichriſtian.* So that the *Controverſy* between us is reduced to this preciſe point, *'Whether before* Boniface the *Third's 'time the* Pope *enjoyed a Supreme Juriſdiction over the Catholic Church.* This he denies. On the contrary I here engage my ſelf not only to prove he had it, but moreover, that not the leaſt degree or *Iota* of *Juriſdiction* will be impos'd on them to acknowledge, for enjoying the Communion of the *Catholic Church* more than the very ſame that Pope Boniface's *Predeceſſors* within the times of the *four firſt General Councils* confeſſedly exerciſed. I may adde, that the *new uſurped Title, (as he ſays) ſold to him by* Phocas, did not give him, neither did he pretend to by it, any more authority than himſelf and his Predeceſſors for-

merly enjoy'd. And this if I be able to make good, then not all the water in the Sea will be able to wash off his Churches *Schism* by his own confession.

3. Before I shew what *Supremacy* the Predecessor's of *Boniface the Third* exercised in the Church, it will be convenient to enquire into the Bargain that, He says, *Boniface* made with *Phocas*; what he gain'd by it; and why his Predecessors St. *Gregory the Great*, and *Pelagius* refused it.

The *Patriark* of *Constantinople*, *John*, out of an humor of lightness and vanity, proper to the *Grecians*, assumed the Title of [*Episcopus universalis*, or *Oecumenicus*] *Universal Bishop*, or *Bishop of the whole World*: A *Title* that the Council of *Chalcedon* had in an Epistle given to *Pope Leo*, but which his *Successors* lik't not. Certain it is that *John* intended little more by it, but to be a distinction of honor and preference above the other *Eastern Patriarks*: For whilst he took that *title*, he still acknowledg'd the *Pope's Superiority*, not only of *place*, but *authority* over him. But being *Bishop* in a City, wherein the *Emperor of the world* resided, he thought it not unbecomming him to be called *the Bishop of the world*, as the *Emperor* was the Governor. Perhaps indeed his *Successors*, (if this ambition had been either approv'd, or but conniv'd at by the *West*) would have endeavour'd to make it not a meer empty *Title*, but would have invaded an

Au-

Authority, which the *Title* might ſeem to warrant. Hereupon *Pope Pelagius* and after him *Pope Gregory the Great* did vehemently reſiſt this fooliſh ambition of *John*, though the *Emperor* himſelf, to gain a dignity to his own *City*, favor'd it in him.

4. Now the *Arguments* that theſe two good *Popes* made uſe of againſt him, did not ſo much combate *Johns* preſent intention (though his meer vain-glory and affectation of *Novelty* deſerved to be repreſſed) as the probable conſequences of ſuch a *Title*, which might argue, that beſides himſelf there were no Biſhops in the *Church*: For if he were the *Univerſal Biſhop*, and the whole world his *Dioceſs*, ſince by the *Canons* there can be but *one Biſhop* in a place, it would follow that all others were only *Biſhops in name*, and by their Character had no other office but as his *Subſtitutes* depending on his will, whereas the *Apoſtles* received their Office and Authority immediately from *our Lord* himſelf: And ſo their Succeſſors, the *Biſhops*, would never acknowledge a receiving their *Epiſcopal* character and right of *Juriſdiction* from any but *Chriſt* himſelf. For, as in other *Sacraments*, whoever adminiſters Baptiſm, whether an *Apoſtle* or an *Heretic*, *Baptiſmus ſolius Chriſti eſt*, ſays Saint *Auguſtin*: And again, *Peter and John* (ſayth he) *pray'd that the Holy Ghoſt might come on thoſe upon whom they impoſed their hands, they did not give the Holy*

Ghost (Acts 8.) They, as his *Substitutes* apply the outward Element, but the inward vertue of the *Sacrament* is administred only by *our Lord* himself. And as a Subject that receives an *Office* of *Jurisdiction* from the *King*, will not esteem he derives that *Authority* from the Person, who presents him the *Letters patents*, or invests him ceremoniously in the *Office*, but only *the King*. So though a particular *Bishop* be ordained by a *Metropolitan*, a *Primat*, a *Patriarc*, or by *the Pope* himself, and *Jurisdiction* given him, they indeed are the *Ministers* of *Christ* to convey his Characters and *Authority*, they assign him the place in which he is to exercise that *Authority*, but the *inherent Authority* it self *Christ* only gives him.

Pelag. 2 Epist. 5. Upon these grounds Pope *Pelagius* thus argues. [*Universalitatis quoque nomen, &c.*] *Do not give heed to the name of Universality that* John of Constantinople *hath unlawfully usurped, &c. For none of the Patriarks did ever make use of so profane a Title: Because if* [the Bishop of Rome] *the Supreme* Patriark *be call'd an universal* Patriark, *the Title would be taken away from the rest. But God forbid this should happen, &c. If therefore* John *be permitted to take this Title, the honor of all* Patriarks *is deny'd, and probably he, who is called Universal, will perish in his error, and there will not be found one Bishop in the state of Truth.* The very same arguments he knows St. *Gregory* makes use of in several *Epistles* both,

both to the Emperor, to *John* himſelf, and others, which being already produc'd by him need not be repeated. Yet for all this neither *Pelagius* nor St. *Gregory*, notwithſtanding their deteſting this *Title*, did therefore quit their right to the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip of the Church*, and their *Juriſdiction* over all both *Biſhops* and *Patriarks* too: nay they aſſert it in theſe very *Epiſtles*, wherein they are moſt ſharp againſt that Title, as ſhall be ſhew'd.

6. The reaſon of this, 'tis manifeſt, the Preacher does not underſtand: therefore let him not diſdain to be inform'd. The like Order that is obſerv'd in the *Church* of *England*, he may conceive, is obſerved in the *Catholic Church*: that is, that the ſame perſon may be both a *Biſhop*, an *Archbiſhop*, and a *Primat*; I will add alſo the *Supreme head of the Church*, as the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury* is among *Eccleſiaſticks*: [For as for *his Majeſtys Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical affairs*, it is not in this place to be treated of.] Now my *Lord of Canterbury* is juſt like other *Biſhops*, merely a *Biſhop* in his *Dioceſe of Canterbury*: He is likewiſe a *Metropolitan* in his *Province* to viſit all *Biſhops* in it, but he is not a *Biſhop* in the other *Dioceſes* ſubject to him, for in them none have *Epiſcopal* right but only the reſpective *Biſhops* themſelves, which are not removeable by him, unleſſe they incur crimes that by the *Canons* deſerve it. Laſtly, he is a *Primat* over *both Provinces*, that is, the whole Nation, yet without

without prejudice to the other *Metropolitan*, in whose office of *Visitation* and *Ordinations* he cannot interpose; though he have a power to summon him to a *National Council*, &c. And in this regard he may be stiled the *Universal Pastor of England*, and, by being so, makes the *Church of England* to be *one National Church*, which otherwise would have *two Episcopal heads*. Yet if any one should stile him the *Universal Bishop of England*, it would not be endured, because he can exercise Functions properly *Episcopal* in no other *Province* or *Diocese* but his own. By considering this well, the *Doctor* may more clearly apprehend how matters stand in the *Catholic Church*.

7. For, though this *Title* of *Universal Bishop* taken in some sense, might draw after it such ill consequences, yet being apply'd to the *Supreme Pastor* of God's Church, it might innocently signifie no more but such a general *Superintendency*, as the Scriptures allow to St. *Peter*, and the Canons of the Church also have acknowledged due to his Successors, and with such an innocent meaning (as this Title was used long before in the 3d. *Act* of the Council of *Chalcedon*, without any contradiction of the same Council to *Pope Leo*) *Boniface* the Third did accept it from *Phocas*: yet having done so, it seems to me apparent that he neither exercised nor challenged the least access of *Jurisdiction* by it more than himself

himſelf and his Predeceſſors had enjoy'd. And of this the Doctor himſelf ſhall be Judge. If he can find any proof to the contrary, let him produce it, and I will immediately recall what I have ſaid.

'Tis true, as appears in the *Hiſtory* of the *Council of Trent*, written by the Illuſtrious and learned *Cardinal Palavicino*; that there was in that Council an earneſt and conſtant oppoſition made by the *French Prelates* againſt naming the Pope, *Biſhop of the Univerſal Church*, who, in concluſion, abſolutely gained the ſilencing of that *Title*: But this happened not becauſe theſe denied to the Pope an Univerſal Superintendency over the whole Church, or over all Churches taken diſjunctively, for this they willingly acknowledged; but they oppoſed this Title only as the Univerſal Church might be taken in a collective ſenſe, that is to ſay, as united in a General Council, whereby a right of Superiority over a General Council may ſeem to be determin'd to the prejudice of the *Deciſions* of the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, which in this matter they allowed.

Card. Palav. Hiſt. del. Conc. de Trato. lib. 19. c. 15, 16, &c. lib. 20. c. 3. 9, &c. lib. 21. c. 4, &c.

CHAP.

CHAP. VI.

The abſolute neceſsity of a Supreme Paſtor in the Church. Supremacy of Juriſdiction exerciſed by Pope Boniface *the Third his Predeceſſors, viz.* St. Gregory, P. Pelagius, P. Felix, P. Gelaſius, P. Leo. *The* 28*th. Canon of* Chalcedon *illegal. Of the* 2*d. Canon of the firſt Council of* Conſtantinople.

1. BEing now to demonſtrate (more than a *Primacy* of Order) a *primacy* of *Juriſdiction* in the *Predeceſſors* of *Boniface* the Third, extending it ſelf to all Chriſtians, all particular Prelates and Churches: yet a *Supremacy* not unlimited,

(for

(for then *General Councils* would be useless) but sufficient to preserve unity in the *Church*: I will first, to make it appear reasonable, declare the ground of the necessity of it, which in brief is, as the Preacher will find by the succeeding Testimonies of the *Fathers*; because, since *General Councils* (the only absolute Supreme Authority Ecclesiastical) either for want of agreement among *Princes*, or by the inconvenience of the long absence of *Prelates*, or great expences, *&c.* can very seldom be summon'd, it would be impossible, without an *Ordinary*, constant, standing Supreme *Authority* in the Church, to prevent *Schisms*, that is, it is impossible the Church should subsist.

2. For what effect against *Schism* can be expected from a meer *Primacy of Order*, a πρωτοκλισία, a sitting at the upper end of the Table, a priviledge to speak first, or to collect Votes? Therefore for a *Protestant* to deny a *Primacy of Jurisdiction* to be necessary to conserve unity, as in a *National* Church, so in the *Universal*, is to give up his own cause to the *Presbyterians*. For all the subtilty of human wit, without such a Concession, can never answer the arguing thus, If (*according to the Doctrin of the Fathers*) *there be a necessity of setting up one Bishop over many Presbyters for preventing Schism: there is* (say they) *as great a necessity of setting up one Archbishop over many Bishops, and one Patriark over many Arch-*

Jus Divinum Ministr. Evang. in Append. pag. 5.

Arch-Bishops, and one Pope over all; unlesse men will imagin that there is a danger of Schism only among Presbyters, and not among Bishops, Arch-bishops, &c. which is contrary to reason, truth, history, and experience. But what expedient now, without such a *primacy of Jurisdiction*, can the *Presbyterians* find out against the mischief of *Schism*? Truly no other, but by rejecting that *Article of the Creed* in which we professe the (certainly visible) *unity of the Catholic Church*, that is, by believing that *Schism* is no such ill thing, as that much care needs be used to prevent it. But surely *English Protestants*, not having blotted out of their Creed that *Article*, since they aknowledge the constituting *one Bishop* necessary to the unity of a *Diocesse*, &c. will find great difficulty to shew a reason why *one Governor* is not as necessary to the *unity* of the whole *Church*, to which only both *unity* and *Indefectibility* is promised, and without which, the unity of *Provinces* or *Dioceses* are but *factions*.

3. Certain it is, that the antient *Fathers* thought so, as shall be shewed. And because new opinions arising do naturally cause debates and contentions, from what causes soever they flow, and contentions are apt to generate *Schisms*, since likewise *Ecclesiastical Lawes* are made to be observed every where, if any particular *Church* were *Independent* of the whole, there could be no remedy against *Divisions*; hence it is, that the *Holy Fathers* do

assert

assert the necessity of a *Supream Authority*, and assign thereto these *Acts*. 1. Either to determine, or at least silence Disputes about opinions. 2. In those which are called *majores causæ*, (as wrongful Depositions of Bishops, &c.) either by *appeals* or *consultations* to restore the Persons wrong'd, and punish the wrong-doers. 3. To take care that *Discipline*, establish'd by received *Canons*, be every where observ'd. 4. To judge when there is a necessity of convening in *General Councils*, and thereupon to summon all *Bishops*, and, as far as the *Authority* of a *common Spiritual Father* may extend, to oblige *Princes* to permit their respective *Bishops* to meet.

4. These things thus premised, now follow the Proofs demonstrating, that, before *Boniface the thirds* time, such like *Acts* of a *Supream Authority* were practised by his *Predecessors*, and submitted to generally in the Church. I must not write a Volume, therefore I will select a few examples in all Ages, which will at least recompence the *Doctors Anti-quotations*, and when he shall require it, many, many more shall be added.

5. To proceed therefore *ascendendo*; St. *Gregory the Great*, Predecessor of *Boniface the third*, though he would not admit an *Universal Episcopacy*, yet at the same time he challenged and exercised an *Universal Superintendency*: Hence, saies he, *'tis notorious that the See Apostolic by Divine institution is preferr'd before all Churches.* A. D. 590. *Greg. M. lib. 2. Indict. 11. Ep. 3.*

Churches. And again more fully; *The care of the Church was committed to the holy Apostle, and Prince of the Apostles, St.* Peter: *The care and principality of the Universal Church was committed to him, and yet he is not called the Universal Apostle.* Again, writing to the Bishop of *Syracusa*, *If any fault be found in any Bishops, I know no Bishop that is not subject to the See Apostolic: But when no fault exacts it, we are all, in regard of humility, equal.* And *this subjection,* saies he elsewhere, *both our most Religious Lord the Emperor, and our Brother* (John) *Bishop of the same City do frequently protest.* And in an Epistle to *Natalis, Bishop of Salona, If,* saith he, *any of the four Patriarks had committed such an act, so great a disobedience would not have passed without great scandal.* Moreover in another *Epistle* he declares how he had reversed the judgment of the *Church of Constantinople* against a *Priest* of *Chalcedon*, where he saies, *Dost not thou know that in the cause of* John *the Priest against our Brother and Collegue,* John *of* Constantinople, *he, according to the Canons, had recourse to the See Apostolic, and that the cause was determined by our Sentence?* A world of like examples more may be added: And in these a *primacy of Jurisdiction* is manifest, which therefore by his own confession is no *Usurpation.*

Idem. lib. 7. ind. 2. Epist. 64.

Id. lib. 7. ind. 2. Epist. 64.

Id. l. 2. Indict. 2. Ep. 63.

Id. l. 2. Ind. 10. Ep. 37.

Id. l. 1. Indict. 14. Ep. 24.

A. D. 577. 6. In the next place the immediate Predecessor of St. *Gregory, Pope Pelagius the Second,* in the very same Epistle, in which he condemns

demns the presumptuous *Title* of *Universal Bishop*, assumed by *John of Constantinople*, hath this passage, writing to the *Eastern Bishops*, *The Apostolic See is inform'd that* John *Bishop of* Pelag. 2. Ep. 1. Constantinople *out of this his presumption hath convoked you to a Synod, whereas the authority of assembling general Synods is by a special priviledge deliver'd to the Apostolic See of St.* Peter; *neither can we read of any Synod esteem'd to be ratified, which was not establisht on the Apostolic Authority: Therefore whatever you have decreed in your foresaid Conventicle, by the Authority of St.* Peter, *Prince of the Apostles, and the Speech of our Saviour, who gave to Blessed* Peter *the power of binding and loosing, I do command all things determined by you to be void and repealed, &c.*

Again his, not immediate, *Predecessor, Pope* A.D. 494. *Gelasius* is a yet more full and convincing witnesse to the *Popes Universal Jurisdiction*, upon this occasion. *Pope Felix* the *second*, A.D. 484. who possessed St. *Peters Chair* next before him, had been appealed and complain'd to by *John Patriark of Alexandria*, unjustly dispossessed by *Peter* an *Eutichian*, whom the *Pope* in a *Synod of* 42. *Bishops* excommunicated. Moreover, upon the complaints of the same *John*, he cited *Acacius Bishop* of *Constantinople* to appear: And upon his contumacy excommunicated him likewise in this Form: *Take notice*, saies he, *that thou art deprived of Sacerdotal honor, and Catholic Communion, and moreover, that thou art segregated from the number of the*

Faithful, having loſt both the Name and Office of Prieſtly Miniſtery, being condemned by us by the judgment of the Holy Ghoſt and Apoſtolic Authority. Yet this *Sentence*, not having been, as the former was, denounced in a *Synod*, ſome *Eaſtern Biſhops* found fault with it. Whereupon his next Succeſſor *Pope Gelaſius* juſtifies his proceedings in an *Epiſtle* to the *Biſhop of Dardania*, he ſhews that when any *Heretic* has bin once condemned by a *Synod*, (as *Sabellius*, &c.) there was need of convoking new *Synods* for the condemning his Followers: And that this was the caſe of *Acacius*, who communicated with *Peter* and *Timotheus*, *Biſhops of Alexandria*, *Eutychians*, which Hereſie had been condemned in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*. In conſequence whereto he adds theſe Words: *Neither do we omit to ſignifie, which the whole Church all the world over knows very well, that the See of the bleſſed Apoſtle St.* Peter, *has a power to looſe whatſoever things ſhall be bound by the Sentences of any* Biſhops *whatſoever, as being the Church which has a right to judge every other Church, neither is it permitted to any one to cenſure its judgment: Seeing the Canons have ordain'd that appeals ſhould be made to it from every part of the World.* Are theſe now marks onely of a *Primacy of Order*, and not *Supremacy* of *Juriſdiction?*

Felix 2. in Ep. ad Epiſc. Dard.

7. We will next enlarge a ſtep to *Pope Leo the Great*, who began his *Seat* in the year 440. and in whoſe time the *General Council of Chal-*

A.D. 440.
A.D. 451.

cedon

cedon was assembled. How contagious and constant an Assertor he was of his *Supream Jurisdiction*, most of his *Epistles* witnesse, and almost all *Protestant Controvertists* complain. He in his 53d. *Epistle* to *Anatolius*, Bishop of Constantinople; in the 54th. to the *Emperor Marcianus*; and the 55th. to the *Empresse Pulcheria*, vindicates the Derivation of his Authority, not from the *Imperial City*, but St. Peter, *Prince of the Apostles*. *Leo M. in Ep.* 53. Idem. Ep. 54. Idem Ep. 55.

8. Therefore, whereas the *Preacher* calls to *witnesse the famous Canon of* Chalcedon, *decreeing to the Bishop of* Constantinople *an equality of priviledges with the Bishop of* Rome; *not for any other reason then its having the good hap to be one of the two Imperial Cities.* If he had had a mind to dealingenuously, he would have cal'd it an *infamous Canon* surreptitiously made, saith *Liberatus*, *after the departure of the Judges, the Senate, and of the Legats of the See Apostolic*; and entirely nullyfied by the *protestation* of the said *Legats*, and the *Sentence* of Pope *Leo*, *without whose consent*, according to the antient *traditionary Law*, *nothing made in any* Council *could oblige the Church*. A *Canon* this was, so despised during that whole Age and more, that the memory of it only remained in the *Acts* of that *Council*, but it was not inserted among the other *Canons*, for as it appears by the most antient *Greek* and *Latin Copies* of that *Council*, by the collection of *Dionisius Exiguus*, and by the *Testimony* of *Theodoret* Serm. pag. 19. *Liberat in Brev. cap.* 13. *Socrat. Hist. l.* 2. *c.* 5. *Theodor. Anag. Anag. in Syng. Can.*

Anagnostes a *Grecian*, the *Council* of *Chalcedon* publisht only twenty seven Canons, whereas now this is reckoned the 28th.

Lastly, A *Canon* this was, that *Anatolius* *Bishop* of *Constantinople* (by whose *briguing* with some *Bishops*, and violence to others it was compiled) was himself both ashamed and sorrow for it, as appears by St. *Leo*'s answer to him: And of which Pope *Gelasius* forty years after affirms, That *the See Apostolic never consented to it, the Emperor never imposed it*; Anatolius *never made use of it, and the whole matter was put in the power of the See Apostolic: And therefore what the same See confirm'd, remained in force, and that which it receiv'd not, could not have any firmnesse.*

Leo. Ep. 55. *ad Anat.*

Gelas P. Tom. de Anathem. Vinc.

9. Now because this *enormous Canon* was pretended to be only a renewing of a former *Canon* made in the *second General Council* of *Constantinople*, observe the false dealing of that *Bishop* and his *Clergy*, in citing that *Canon*. For whereas it was thus conceived, *Let the Bishop of* Constantinople *enjoy* (πρεσβεῖα) *prerogatives of honor after the Bishop of* Rome: These renewers of this Canon at *Chalcedon*, fraudulently thrust in the words [ἴσα πρεσβεῖα] *equal priviledges*: As if, excepting only the sitting in the second Chair, he was to enjoy in the *Church* all the *prerogatives* of the *See Apostolick*: A fancy which never entred into the minds of those former *Bishops*. And indeed *de facto* after the *fourth Council* of *Chalcedon*,

A.D. 381.

Conc. Constantinop. 1. Can. 3.

cedon, the *new Patriark*, by vertue of the exotic power given him, presumed to summon all the other *Patriarks* and *Bishops* in the *East* to a *Council*; An attempt repressed by *Pope Leo*.

And no doubt when afterward they usurped the *Title* of *Oecumenical Bishop*, they would not fear to give the same *Title* of *Oecumenical* to their *Councils* too.

10. And as for the *second Canon* of that *Council* of *Constantinople* quoted in the Margin of the Sermon, whereby the *Eastern Patriarks are forbidden to meddle in Ecclesiastical affairs beyond the limits of their Provinces*, what is this to the *Bishop* of *Rome*? He is not so much as named nor thought of in that *Canon*: Neither was there ever any received *Council in Gods Church* that excluded him from an *universal Jurisdiction*, which the *Doctor* sees was exclaimed by so many *Popes* at and after the *Council of Chalcedon*, and he will see more before it. Serm. pag. 18. *Concil. Const.* 1. *Can.* 2.

CHAP. VII.

The Pope's *Supremacy confirmed by a Law of the Emperor* Valentinian. *Decrees of* Pope's *had antiently the force of Lawes: Yet with restriction. The* Pope's *Supream Jurisdiction confirmd by Examples in the Eastern Church. Appeals to the See Apostolic decreed at* Sardica, *where were present British Bishops. Of the first Council at* Arles, *where British Bishops likewise were present. The sixth Canon of the Council of* Nice *explain'd.*

Novel. Theodos. Tit. 24. A.D. 424.

1. THere was an *Imperial Law* made by *Valentinian* the *third*, (who began his Reign A. D. 424.) directed to the *Bishops of France*, importing that *Whatever had been, and should be establish'd by the See Apostolick, should have*

have the force of a Law to them and all others. And this the *Emperor* saies is *Secundum veterem consuetudinem.* Moreover to shew the grounds of that *Law*, he further saies, *That the Supremacy of the See Apostolic has been established both by the merit of St. Peter, who is the Prince of Episcopal Society, and by the dignity of the City, and by the sacred Authority of a Synod.* Ibid. Ibid.

2. Now if we shall consider the weight of such *a publick Testimony*, and how *Christian Catholick Emperors* never made *Lawes* touching *Ecclesiastical* matters, but by the advice of *Bishops*, and for the corroborating of former *Church Canons* both touching *Faith* and *Discipline*, and by no means for introducing of new ones, we shall find a greater proof can scarce be produced against the *Preachers pretention, That between the times of the four first General Councils the Popes enjoyed only a primacy of Order, and not Jurisdiction.*

3. Though this *Law* seems too excessively large, commanding *That whatever had been or should be, &c.* *Pope Leo*, who lived in the same Age, limits the true sense of it, when he commands *That all the Decretals and Constitutions both of Pope* Innocent, *and all other his Predecessors, should be observed, namely, such as are publish't touching Ecclesiastical Orders and Canons*: Or, as *Pope Hilarius* expresses it, *What ever Constitutions have been made by Popes for the quiet of all Gods Priests, the observance of Discipline and taking away confusions.* *Leo in Decret. T. 5.* *Hilar. P. in Ep. ad Ep. Provinc. Vien.*

4. Exam-

4. Examples of such publick *Decrees* of unquestion'd Authority, even in the judgement of the most learned *Protestants*, we finde made by *Pope Zosimus*, *Pope Innocent* the First, and *Pope Siricius*, who governed the Church between the yeares 385. and 418. For as for the *Decretals* pretended to be made by antecedent *Popes*, they do except against them, and perhaps not without ground. He will not expect I should transcribe those authentick Decrees to weary both him and my self unnecessarily. He knows very well where to find them. I will only adde, that such *Decrees* were actually received as Laws by the Churches of *Spain*, *France*, &c. Hence it is, that in the *fourth* Council of Toledo, the Bishops say, *For what is to be observed by us in such Cases, Let us be informed by the Precepts of the Apostolick See, and not follow our own, but our common Fathers Instruction.* And the Council of *Tours* says, *What Bishop shall presume to act contrary to such Decrees as have proceeded from the See Apostolick?* Notwithstanding, it was not forbidden to *Bishops* to consider and examin such *Decrees*; for if they were made upon misinformation, even *Popes* themselves have declared that the force of them should be suspended. And much more, if against the *ancient Canons*; for saith Pope *Zosimus* (*ap. Gratian.* 25. *q.* 1.) *Even this Seat hath not Authority to constitute or change any thing contrary to the Statute of the Fathers.*

A. D. 385. to 418.

Zosim in Decret. c. 1. 2 *Innocent. in Decret. c.* 21. & *tit.* 45, 46, 47.

Conc. Toletan. 4.

Conc. Turon. 11. *can.* 20.

5. As

5. As for the more *Primitive times* preceding these, I will content my self with a few examples, but such, and of so great weight, that if the Preacher will be ingenuous, they will even content him. In the recounting of them it will not be necessary, I should observe exactly the Order of times in each of them. And the first shall be a passage of the great Saint *Basil*, who writing to St. *Athanasius* about suppressing *Arianism* in the *East*, hath these words, *It seems convenient to us to write to the Bishop of* Rome, *to desire him that he would have regard to our affaires, and interpose the judgment of his Decree, &c. Moreover that he would give Authority to some choice persons, who may bring the Acts of the Council of* Ariminum *for the annulling of those things that were violently done there, &c.* Basil. Ep. 52.

6. Again, when the *Synod* of *Antioch* about the year 343. assembled by *Arians* to the prejudice of the *Council* of *Nice*, had framed a new confession of Faith, it was *argued of nullity*, saith *Socrates*, especially because *Julius Bishop of* Rome *was neither himself present, nor sent any to supply his place: Whereas* (saith he) *the Ecclesiastical Canon commands, that no Decrees be established in the Church without the assent of the Bishop of* Rome. And this authority the same *Pope Julius* asserts. For writing to the *Eastern Bishops*, who had condemned St. *Athanasius*, he sayes thus, [Ἀγνοεῖτε, &c.] *Are you ignorant, this is the* A. D. 343. Socrat. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 5. Apud Athanas. Apol. 2.

customs that you should first write to us, and after that determin just matters there? Therefore if there were any ill suspition against that Bishop [*of* Alexandria] *you ought to have signified it in the first place to the Church here.*

Sozom. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c 9.

7. Consonantly hereto *Sozomen*, another *Greek Historian* saith expresly, That *there was received in the Church a Sacerdotal law, declaring all things to be void that are done without the sentence of the Bishop of* Rome. Nay, which is yet more, this (which for ought appears was only an *unwritten* Canon or Custom, for no *Council* mentions it, but deliver'd by *Tradition* even in the *Eastern Churches*) was of such authority, that the foresaid Emperor *Valentinian* makes it a *Law-Imperial*: *We decree*, says he, *that according to the antient custom nothing be innovated in the Church without the sentence of the Bishop of* Rome. Surely Dr. *Pierce* will acknowledge these *Testimonies* argue more than a *Primacy of Order*; here is a *Jurisdiction* asserted, extending it self beyond the *Diocesan*, *Metropolitan* or *Patriarcal* limits of *Rome*.

Novel. Theodos. tit. 24.

8. I will add a few examples more: when some *Eastern Councils* had deposed *Athanasius*, *Patriark of Alexandria*, *Paul Bishop of Constantinople*, *Marcellus Primat of Ancyra*, and *Asclepas*, *Bishop of Gaza*, 'The Bishop of 'Rome, (saith *Sozomen*, (to whom for the dig-'nity of his Throne the care of all things does 'pertain) restored to every one of them their 'own

Sozom. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. c. 2.

'own Church. *And he adds further*, That 'he commanded those who had deposed them 'to appear on a day appointed at *Rome*, to 'give account of their judgement: threat-'ning that he would not leave them unpu-'nish'd, if they did not cease from innovating. All this he did, saith *Theodoret*, [not by usurpation, but [τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς διατάξεως νόμῳ] *following the Churches law.* *Theod. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. c. 4.*

9. Again, when the *General council of Ephesus* was entring into debate about the cause of *John Patriark* of *Antioch*, the *Bp.* of *Jerusalem* interposed, affirming, *that according to the antient custom, the Church of* Antioch *was alwayes governed by the Roman; Whereupon the whole Council* remitted the judgement of that Cause to the *Pope.* *Cyr. Ephes. p. 2. act. 5. in relat. ad Calest.*

10. Moreover, when *Dioscorus*, *Patriark* of *Alexandria*, in the *Scismatical Council* of *Ephesus* had deposed *Flavian Bishop* of *Constantinople*, *Flavian* appealed to the Pope. And this he did [κατὰ τὸ ἔθος τῶν συνόδων] *according to the custom of Synods*, sayth the Emperor *Valentinian.* *Epist. ad Theodos. in preamb. Conc. Chalced.*

11. Two examples more I will the rather add, because we of this Nation are particularly concern'd in them. The first is taken out of the famous *Council* of *Sardica* assembled about twenty years after that of *Nice.* This *Council* was by *Justinian* called *Oecumenical*, because, though the *Eastern Bishops* departed before the conclusion; yet the *Canons* of it A.D. 345. were

Concil. Sardic. can. 3, 4.

were never rejected by them. In the third and fourth *Canons* of this Council it was ordain'd, upon a proposal made by the famous *Osius* of *Corduba*, to this effect, *That in any Controversies between Bishops which could not be determined in their own respective Provinces, the person aggrieved might appeal to the Bishop of* Rome, *who might renew the Process and appoint Judges: And* (by a second proposal of *Gaudentius* a *Bishop*) *in case any Bishop deposed should make such an appeal, till the Pope had determin'd the cause, it was not permitted that another Bishop should be ordained in his place.* These Decrees the Council made *to honor the memory of St. Peter the Apostle.*

12. Now at this *Council* among other *Bishops* from all the *Western Countreys*, some came out of our *Britany*, as St. *Athanasius* an eye-witness assured us. And therefore the *General Superintendency* of the Pope over all *churches* could not have been unknown in this Nation long before St. *Augustin* the *Monk*, or the *Saxons* had possession here. By which may appear the slightness of the late found *Welsh paper*, though much bragged of, in which the *Abbot* of *Bangor* is said to have refused the subjection to the *Pope*, which St. *Augustin* requir'd of the *British Bishops*. For what grosse ignorance was it in this *Abbot* (if the Paper relate truth of him) That after all that power exercised by that man called the *Pope* over the whole Church of God, especially o-

Athan. Apol. 2.

ver

ver the Western Provinces, and so much respect return'd him from them after the presence of the British Bishops at so many famous *Councils*, and after so many holy Bishops sent for the conversion of these Islands by the Bishops of *Romes* delegation, he should be such a stranger to his person, or authority, or his titles, after the year of our Lord 600? At which time also the Irish Bishops are found to have yielded all obedience to this *Roman* Bishop, when the *Britains* thus denied it, as appears Both in that they are said by *venerable Beda* (the South-Irish at least) to have returned very early to a right observation of Easter *Ad admonitionem Apostolicæ sedis Antistitis*, and also in that about this time they sent Letters to St. *Gregory* then *Pope*, to know after what manner they ought to receive into the Church such as were converted from *Nestorianism*, to whom he sends his Orders concerning it directed *Quirino Episcopo & cæteris Episcopis in Hybernia Catholicis*, as may be found in the Register of his Epistles. *Hist. l. 3. c. 3.* *Greg. 9 ep. 61.*

13. A *second Monument* wherein we *Britains* have a peculiar interest, is that most antient first *Council* of *Arles*, celebrated according to *Baronius* and *Sirmondus* (assented to by Sir *Henry Spelman*) in the year 314. about eleven years before the first *Council of Nice*. The *Canons* of this *Council* are directed to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as appears by the first *Canon* in these A. D. 314.

Conc. Arlat. can. 1.

these words, *First concerning the Paschal observation of our Lord, that it be observed by us upon one day and at one time through the whole world; and that according to custom thou wouldst direct Letters to all.* And moreover in the head of the *Canons* is inserted this *Breviary* of their Epistle, *To our most holy Lord and Brother* Silvester, Marinus *and the Synod of Bishops assembled together in the Town of* Arles: *We have signified to your charity the things decreed by common Council, to the end that all may know what they ought for the future to observe.* Here may be seen a *Patriarchical council* sending their *Decrees* to the *Bishop of Rome*, as being the chief person from whom all Christians are to receive information of what they ought to believe and practise, and by whom no doubt they were to be obliged thereto. In which regard St. *Martin*, *Pope* and *Martyr*, makes this the *Popes* most proper *Title*, that he is *Custos Canonum Divinorum*.

14. At this *Council* were present three *Bishops* Representatives of the *British Clergy*, Eborius *Bishop* of *York*, *Restitutus Bishop* of *London*, *Adelphius Bishop* of (*Maldon*, called then) *Colonia Londinensium*, with *Sacerdos*, *a Priest*, and *Arminius*, *a Deacon*. And the *Canons* of this *Council*, were by *Restitutus* brought into *Britany*, saith *Bishop Godwin* out of *Bale*. By which also it appears that neither the *Pope* himself, nor his place and authority in the *Church* were unknown, nor un-acknowledged by

by the *Britains* long before St. *Auguſtines* days.

15. And now it will be ſeaſonable to anſwer the *Doctors* great Objection grounded on that famous 6*th. Canon* of the firſt *Nicene Council*, by which he ſays, *Every* Patriarch *and Biſhop is appointed to be chief in his proper Dioceſe, as the Biſhop of Rome is chief in his.* This is now to be examin'd. The words of the Canon are, [τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, &c.] *Let the antient Cuſtoms be ſtill in force in* Egypt, Lybia, *and* Pentapolis, *that the Biſhop of* Alexandria *enjoy a Juriſdiction over them all: In as much as ſuch likewiſe is the cuſtom of the Biſhop of* Rome. *In like manner both in* Antioch *and other Provinces, let the* [πρεσβεῖα] *priviledges be preſerv'd entire to every Church.* Serm. pag. 18. Conc. Niten. 1. can. 6.

16. The true ſenſe of this Canon will beſt appear from the end for which it was enacted, and that apparently was for the regulating and compoſing diſorders begun in *Egypt* by *Meletius* Biſhop of *Lycopolis*, who rebelliouſly refuſed obedience to the *Patriark* of *Alexandria*, preſuming to ordain *Biſhops* independently on him. This *Sciſmatical* attempt the *Council* here repreſſes, commanding *that according to the antient cuſtom the* Biſhop *of* Alexandria *ſhould have entire Juriſdiction through all* Egypt, Lybia, *and* Pentapolis. And the Roman Biſhop in his Patriarchat, and may ſay in his Metropolitanſhip too is made the Patern according to which this Regulation

tion is framed not in regard of his plenary right, and universal Jurisdiction in the Church of God, which I have shewed already, and shall demonstrate the same yet further, even in the times preceding this Council) is extended to the whole world, and was exercised over the Patriarcs themselves, But only of the custom and practice of his calling Synods, correcting manners, and making ordinations according to his Patriarkal and Metropolitical Jurisdiction: for those words in the sixth *Nicene Canon*, *Similiter autem & apud cæteras provincias*, *In like manner in the rest of the Provinces*, that is, those Provinces also that were not such where a Patriarc resided, *Honor suus unicuique servetur*, *Let every one's Honor be preserved to him*, compared with the second Canon of the first *Council* of *Constantinople*, and the eighth canon of the *Ephesian Council*, shew clearly enough, that not only Patriarkical authority, but Metropolitical also is spoken of in this canon, and the Roman Bishops authority also herein made a Pattern. And upon this ground that the Canon intends not to equalize the Bishop of *Alexandria* with the Bishop of *Rome* in his full Jurisdiction, the most learned *Marca* late Archbishop of *Tholouse* observes, that those who object it against the Popes Primacy, though they fortifie themselves even with *Russinus* his interposition of suburbicarian Churches will gain but little by it, for it signifies

De concord. Sacerd. & Imperii, l. 7, n. 6.

ſignifies no more but that the Biſhop of *Rome* did ordain either immediately or by Commiſſion all the Biſhops in the Suburbicarian Churches; ſo ought the Biſhop of *Alexandria* to do in *Egypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis*.

17. But, though I mention this Verſion of *Ruffinus*, becauſe it is much applauded by our primitive Reformers, and I expect Doctor *Pierce*, in his Reply, will have recourſe to it, yet it is a moſt groundleſſe and ſenceleſſe Tranſlation, or rather corruption of the Canon; His words are, *Ut apud Alexandriam, & in urbe Roma vetuſta conſuetudo ſervetur, ut ille Egypti, vel hic Suburbicariarum Eccleſiarum ſollicitudinem gerat.* Againſt which ſo much hath been written that it would be to loſe time to repeat it, eſpecially to the Doctor, who cannot be unacquainted with what * *Eraſmus* and ‖ *Scaliger* have obſerved of the Interpreter, that it is his cuſtom to omit, pervert and change the Text as he pleaſes; and what Others with much Learning and Judgement have ſaid to this interpretation. Not to ſpeak of the Biſhop of *Rome*'s juriſdiction as firſt Patriarc, whereby the other Patriarcs were ſubordinate to him, being obliged even in this matter of their own Ordinations to give him notice, ſending withal a Confeſſion of their Faith, upon the approbation whereof, and of the legality of their Election and Ordination, He confirmed them or otherwiſe depoſed them, of which

* Eraſm Præf. in Hilar.
‖ Scalig. in Chron. Euſeb. Baron Spond. Annal. 325. Peron. rep. to K. *Jam.* c. 33.

many examples may be produced: Whosoever hath but looked into Ecclesiastical History must confesse that His particular Patriarchat was far from being confined to the ten Suburbicarian Provinces subject to the Vicariat of *Rome*: Nay, it is manifest that it extended to the whole Western Empire, which, besides *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, *Germany*, *Britany*, the *six Maritime Provinces of Africa*, &c. contained *Illyricum*, *Macedon*, *Epyrus*, *Greece*, and the *Islands* near it; And all this by the confessions of Adversaries, *Zonaras*, *Balsamon*, &c. writing on this very Canon. Hence St. *Basil* calls the *Bishop of Rome* [αὐτοκέφαλον πολιτείαν] *the head or chief of the Western Regions*. And St. *Augustin* says, that *Pope Innocent did preside over the VVestern Church*. And St. *Hierom*, *Let them* (says he) *condemn me as an Heretic with the VVest, as an Heretic with Egypt, that is with Damasus* and *Peter*. And *Justinian* the *Emperor* affirms, that *all the Regions of the VVorld are subject to the five Patriarcs, that is* [τὴν ἑσπερίαν Ῥώμην] *to VVestern Rome, Constantinople, Alexandria, Thessalonica* (*or Antioch*) *and Jerusalem*. Now unless *Hesperia* signifies the whole *VVest*, to what Patriarc was *France*, *Spain*, *Africa*, &c. subject. If not to *Rome*, how can all *Bishops* be said to be subject to *five Patriarcs*? Hence the *VVestern Bishops* are by *Theodoret* call'd τῶν ἑσπερίων; and by *Sacrates* Ἑσπερίοι.

Basil. Epist. 10.

August. l. 1. cont. Julian. c. 2.

Hieron. Epist. 77.

Justin. Novel. 123.

Theod. l. 5. c. 23.

Socrat. l. 2. c. 29.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Proofs of the Popes Supreme Jurisdiction before the first Council of Nice. *How all Apostles and all Bishops equal: and how Subordinate. St.* Peter *had more than a Primacy of Order. Of St.* Paul's *resisting St.* Peter. *The Popes Supremacy not dangerous to States. On the contrary, &c. Protestants writing in favour of it.*

1. BUt as yet our Proofs of *Primacy* of *Jurisdiction* in the Successor of St. *Peter*, though they reach to the *Beginning* in the latitude fixed by the Doctor, and truly I am perswaded to an indifferent Reader will appear more credible than any his Margins furnish to the contrary: Yet they may be continued, till we come even to the *Presbyterians*, *Independants* and *Quakers Beginning*

too, that is, the *Gospels* themselves. To demonstrate this, we will make a short enquiry into the times of the Church before *Constantin*, whilst it was a mere suffering Church, incapable of conspiring either in or out of *General Councils*: But withal a Church lesse dispersed and torn by *Heresies* or contentions among *Bishops*, and therefore lesse needing this Preservative against *Schisms*, *Supreme Authority*.

2. In these holy peaceable times therfore before *Silvester*, I will content my self with two or three examples to prove the acknowledgement of such a *Primacy*. And the first shall be of St. *Melchiades* the immediat Predecessor of Pope *Silvester*: St. *Augustin* will afford us a Testimony of his care and authority extended into *Africk*, whose words are, [*Qualis ipsius Melchiadis ultima est prolata Sententia, &c.*] "Such an one was the last sentence "*Melchiades* himself pronounced (in judge-"ing the cause of *Donatus*:) by which he "would not have the boldnesse to remove "from his Communion his Collegues, (the "Catholic *Bishops* in *Africa*) in whom no "crime could be proved: And having censu-"red most deeply *Donatus* alone, whom he "found to have been the Original of all the "mischief, he gave a free choyce of healing "the breaches of *Scism* to all the rest of his "Followers: being also in a readinesse to send "communicatory Letters to those (subdi-

A. D. 311.

Aug Epist. 162.

"vided

" vided *Seiſmatics*) that were ordained by " *Majorinus* (a *Donatiſt Biſhop:*) in ſo much " as his Sentence was, that in whatſoever Ci- " ties of *Africk* there were two Biſhops diſ- " ſenters (a *Catholic* and a *Donatiſt*) he ſhould " be confirm'd in the Biſhoprick, who was " firſt ordained, &c. and that another Dio- " ceſe ſhould be provided which the other " ſhould govern. O Son of Chriſtian peace! " and truly Father of the Chriſtian flock, ſays " *St. Auguſtin.*

3. I will add to this three other *examples*, in which, though as to the uſe and adminiſtration of the *Superintendency* ſom Objections have been made, yet they ſuffice to confirm the acknowledgement of ſuch a *Superintendency* in the *Pope*, as the *Preacher* denies. The *firſt* is of *Pope Stephanus* contemporary with *St. Cyprian* and his fellow in Martyrdom, concerning whom we read in *Euſebius*, that he either inflicted, or at leaſt threatned excommunication to ſom of the Churches of *Aſia* that held a neceſſity of *Rebaptization* after *Baptiſm* received by *Heretics*. And in the ſame quarrel, between the ſame *Pope Stephanus* and *St. Cyprian* himſelf, matters were almoſt brought to the like extremity: yet neither did *St. Cyprian*, though wonderfully ſharp, nor even that violent *Cappadocian Biſhop*, *Firmilianus* ever queſtion the *Popes* Authority, though, as they thought, unjuſtly employed.

A. D. 258. Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccleſ. lib. 7. c. 4. 6.

Cypr. Epiſt. 75.

4. The *other* is extant in the same St. *Cyprian*, who endeavour'd to perswade the Pope to depose *Marcianus* a *Metropolitan Bishop of Arles*, siding with *Novatian*; His words to Pope *Stephanus* about it are these, *Let Letters be directed from thee into the Province, and to the people of* Arles, *commanding that* Marcianus *be excommunicated, and another put in his place.* And to the like purpose is another Epistle of his in a cause touching two *Spanish Bishops*, upon mis-information restor'd by the *Pope*.

Id. Epist. 67.

Id. Epist. 68.

A.D. 191. 5. The *third* is that so well known example of *Pope Victor*, concerning whom *Eusebius* thus writes, Victor *endeavours to cut off from the fellowship of Communion the Churches of* Asia, *as declining into Heresie, and sends Letters by which he would divide them all indifferently from the Ecclesiastical Society*, &c. *But there are extant Letters of Bishops by whom* Victor *is sharply reproved, as one that was careless of the commodity of the whole Church.* Particularly *Ireneus reprehends him, telling him, that he did very ill to divide from the unity of the whole Body so many and so great Churches.* Now in such reproofs from *Ireneus*, and even *Polycrates* an *Asian Bishop*, himself the ring-leader of the party of the *Quarto decimani* against St. *Victor*, it was not imputed to *Victor* that he exercised an usurped Authority over *Bishops* not subject to him, but that the cause of exercising his just Authority was not sufficiently weighty.

Euseb. Hist. Eccl.

6. Having

6. Having proceeded thus far, our last step shall be to the utmost degree, the very *beginning* it self, our *Lord* and St. *Peter* in the *Gospels*. And here we will acknowledge what the *Doctor* saies, that all the *Twelve Apostles were equally foundations of the Churches building: That the same Authority which was first given to St.* Peter *alone, sustaining the person of the whole Church, was afterward given to the rest of the Apostles; that as St.* Cyprian *saies, the same that St.* Peter *was, the rest of the Apostles likewise were* [*pari consortio præditi, &c.*] *endowed with an equal participation of honor and power. And as St.* Hierom *affirms, that all Bishops in all places whether at* Rome *or* Eugubium, [Canterbury *or* Rochester] *are of the very same merit, &c.* But he will give leave to the Scripture to interpret it self, and to the Fathers to interpret both it and themselves. We grant therefore that *all the Apostles, and all Bishops* their Successors, enjoy the whole latitude of *Apostolic* and *Episcopal Jurisdiction*, for as much as concerns the *internal, essential qualifications* of either: But for the external administration there may be, and alwaies was acknowledged, a subordination and different latitude in the exercise of the same authority both among the *Apostles* and *Bishops*. Let him not find fault with this distinction; for they themselves have occasion sometimes to make use of it to the like purpose. *Arch-bishop Whitgift*, in his Defence of the Answer to the Ad- Serm. page. 18.

Admonition, affirms, that *Archbishops, quoad Ministerium, do not differ from other Pastors, but touching Government*, page 303. And afterward page 386. Answering the same Argument out of St. *Hierom*, who equals the meanest Bishop with the Pope, he sales, *that they are equal quoad Ministerium, but not quoad politiam.*

7. Let him take therefore an example illustrating this at home. What Function, what *Act* of *Jurisdiction* can my *Lord of Canterbury* exercise (I mean according to their Tenets) which the meanest of his subordinate *Bishops* cannot perform? He can ordain *Bishops* and *Priests*; So can they; the former with him, the other without him. He can visit his *Province*; they their *Diocese*. He can give the *Holy Ghost* by *Confirmation*; So can they. He can assemble a *Provincial Council*; They a *Diocesan*. He has a *Canonical Authority* over *Bishops*, &c. They over *Priests*. He can absolve from *Censures* inflected by himself; they can do as much. Yet nothing of all this excludes him from enjoying a special priviledge in the exercise of every one of these *Acts* and Functions, or exempts them from Subordination to him as their *Superior*, yea, *Supream Pastor*, *Supream* not in *Order* only, but *Jurisdiction*. Certainly the *Doctor* can easily apply this to St. *Peter*, and the rest of the *Apostles*, or to St. *Peter's Successors*, and all other *Bishops*.

8. Now if the *Fathers* may be believed, is

was

was a *priviledge*, and a great one, that St *Peter*, for the merit of his Confession, had *Christs* own Title, as *Christ* was Governor of the Church, given him, of being called a *Rock*. For in the *Syrian* language, in which our Lord spake, the words have no different termination, as in the Greek or Latin, *Petrus*, *Petra*; but the words were, *Thou art Cepha*(a Rock) *and upon this Cepha*(Rock) *I will build my Church*. It was a *priviledge* that *Peter*, neither the eldest, nor first chosen *Apostle*, is alwaies in the Gospel first reckoned, and expressly called, πρῶτος, the First. It was a *priviledge* importing a greater latitude of *Jurisdiction*, when after our Lord's Resurrection, St. *Peter* alone had in the midst of the rest a Commission given him of indefinitly feeding *Christ's Flock*; And after the Descent of the *Holy Ghost*, was peculiarly appointed the *Apostle* of the *Circumcision*, as St. *Paul* was of the *Gentiles*: Yea that the *Dedication* of St. *Paul's* Office was performed by St. *Peter*, who by immediate revelation was appointed to gather the first fruits of the *Gentiles*, in the conversion of *Cornelius*, and his house-hold, &c.

9. But, why among such Governors as the *Apostles*, was any *Supereminency* of *Jurisdiction* given to one man? Certain it is, there never was lesse necessity to provide against disobedience and dis-unions, then among the *Apostles*; every one of whom was guided by

a *Divine* unerring light, by which they knew all Truth, and repleniſh'd with the *Spirit of Charity* and *Unity*, which exempted them from all ambitious, envious or malicious deſigns: Yet a *Subordination*, not abſolutely neceſſary to them, was eſtabliſhed among them, for the ſucceeding Churches ſake, which without ſuch order would in a very ſhort time become a meer *Babel*. Hence St. *Hieron* ſaies, *The Church was built upon* Peter: *though true it is the ſame thing is done upon others, and that the ſtrength of the Church equally reſts upon all. But among the twelve one is choſen that a Head being conſtituted, the occaſion of Schiſm may be taken away.*

Hieron. cont. Jovin. lib. 2.

Cypr. de unit. Eccleſiæ.

10. To the ſame purpoſe St. *Cyprian*, notwithſtanding the Sentence produced by the Preacher out of him, *That all the Apoſtles were* pari conſortio prædîti honoris & poteſtatis; Yet in the very ſame Book ſaies, [*Super unum ædificat Eccleſiam, &c.*] *Our Lord builds his Church upon one Perſon. And, though after his Reſurrection, he gave an equal power to all the Apoſtles, ſaying, As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you: Receive the Holy Ghoſt: Whoſe ſins you remit, &c. Yet that he might manifeſt unity, he by his Authority diſpoſed the Original of the ſame Unity beginning from one.* (And preſently after) *Whoſoever holds not the unity of the Church, does he believe that he holds the Faith? He that oppoſes and reſiſts the Church; he that forſakes the Chair of S.* Peter, *upon which the Church is founded, does*

Ibid.

Ibid.

he

be truſt that he is in the Church? In like manner St. Optatus at Rome, (ſaies he) a Chair was placed for St. Peter, to the end that unity might be preſerved of all; and for fear the other Apoſtles ſhould challenge to themſelves each one a particular Chair. So St. Chryſoſtome, Obſerve now, how the ſame John, that a little before ambitiouſly beg'd a preferment, after yields entirely the Supremacy to St. Peter. And again, Chriſt did conſtitute Peter the Maſter, not of that See of Rome alone, but of the whole world. Optat. cont. Parm. lib. 2. Chryſoſt. in Act. Ap. cap. 1. hom. 3. Id. in. cap. 21. Joan. hom. 87.

11. Now, whereas the Doctor objects that St. Paul's conteſting with St. Peter, and reſiſting him to his face, argues that he did not acknowledge any Superiority in him: Let St. Auguſtin, from St. Cyprian, reſolve us, You ſee (ſaies he to the Donatiſts) what St. Cyprian hath ſaid, that the holy Apoſtle St. Peter, in whom did ſhine forth ſo great a grace of Primacy, being reprehended by St. Paul, did not anſwer that the Supremacy belong'd to him, and therefore he would not be reprehended by one that was poſterior to him. And he adds, The Apoſtle St. Peter hath left to poſterity a more rare example of humility, by teaching men not to diſdain a reproof from inferiors; then St. Paul by teaching inferiors not to fear, reſiſting even the higheſt, yet without prejudice to Charity, when Truth is to be defended. Serm. page 17. Auguſt. lib. 2. de Bapt. cont. Donat. Ibid.

12. From all that has been ſaid on this Subject, it will neceſſarily follow, that whatever Superiority St. Peter enjoyed, and the Holy Fathers acknowledged, was the gift of our Sa-

viour

viour only, a gift far more beneficial to us then to St. *Peter*. He was, as St. *Chryſoſtome* ſaies, *Maſter of the World*, not becauſe his *Throne* was eſtabliſh'd at *Rome*, but receiving from *our Lord* ſo ſupereminent an Authority, he therefore made choice of *Rome* for his *See*; becauſe that being the Imperial City of the World, he might from thence have a more commodious influence on the whole Church.

13. Upon which grounds, whenſoever the *Fathers* make uſe of the Authority of his Succeſſors, *Biſhops* of *Rome* againſt *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks*, they conſider that authority as a *priviledge* annexed to the *Chair of St. Peter*, and only for St. *Peters* regard to the *See* of *Rome*. This is ſo common in the *Fathers* writings, that I will not trouble him with one Quotation. Indeed *John* of *Conſtantinople*, when he would invade an equality [τὰ ἴσα πρεσβεῖα] in ſome ſort with the *Pope*, did wiſely to mention only the *priviledge* of the *Imperial City*, becauſe he could allege no other pretention for his *Plea*. But St. *Leo*, St. *Gregory*, St. *Gelaſius*, &c. produce their evidences for their Supremacy from *Tu es Petrus*, *& ſuper hanc Petram*, &c. from *Paſce oves meas*, &c. Nay, St. *Auguſtin* and other *Biſhops* of the *Milevitan Council*, writing to *Pope Innocent* to joyn with them in condemning the *Pelagians*, tell him their hope was thoſe *Hereticks* would more eaſily be induced to ſubmit to his Authority: Why, becauſe of the

the ſplendor of the *Imperial City*? No, but because the *Popes Authority* was [*de Sanctarum Scripturarum authoritate deprompta*] deduced from the Authority of the Holy Scriptures. August. Ep. 92.

14. I might with reaſon enough, yet I will not omit to take notice of *Doctor Pierce's* trivial reaſonings *againſt the Popes*, (as he calls it,) *pretended Headſhip*; becauſe ſuch being fitted to vulgar capacities, and confidently pronounc'd, do more miſchief, then thoſe that have more ſhew of profundity and weight. Thus then he argues: *If the Pope be head of the Church, then the Church muſt be the Body of the Pope: And if ſo, then when there is no Pope, the Church has no Head: When there are many Popes, the Church has many Heads: When the Pope is Heritical, the Church has ſuch a Head as makes her deſerve to be beheaded.* Serm. Pag 20.

Whatever advantage the *Doctor* expects from ſuch a Diſcourſe as this, it muſt flow from a childiſh Cavil upon the word *Head*, and whatever conſequences he here draws from thence againſt the *Pope*, may as well be applyed to all kind of Governors, whether Eccleſiaſtical or Civil: For they are all Heads within their Precincts: A *King* is the *Head* of his *Kingdom*; and a *Biſhop* of his *Dioceſſe*. When we call therefore the *Pope*, *Head of the Church*, we mean that among all *Governors* thereof, he is the *Supream* in the ſenſe before declared: He is a *Head*, but not ſo as *Chriſt* is in reſpect of

of his *Mystical body*, who by his *Spirit* internally quickens and directs it. The *Pope* is only an *external*, *ministerial*, *visible Head*, and, as it were, *Root* of *Unity* and *Government*.

All this, no question, the *Doctor* knew before to be our meaning: and by consequence he knew that his inferences from thence were pitifully pedantic, & insignificant, though many of his *Court-hearers* and *Country-readers* perhaps wonder there can remain a Papist in *England* unconverted after such a *Sermon* has been publish'd.

25. *When there is no Pope*, says the *Preacher*, *the Church wants a Head*. It is granted: For sure he does not think it is a part of our Faith to believe Popes are immortal. But yet for all that the Papacy is immortal: The Government is not dissolv'd: Succession is not interrupted. It is a Maxim in our Law that *Kings dye not*, that is, the Regal Authority lives, though Kings in their particular persons dye: Nor is there any substantial difference, as to this point, between hereditary and elective Monarchy. And in this sense we may say, that Popes do not, not Bishops: Partly because when a Bishop or the Pope dys, at least his Jurisdiction remains in the *Chapter* or *Body* of *Electors*. Hence it is that in *St. Cyprian* we read *Epistles* of the *Roman Clergy* exercising authority beyond the *Diocese* of *Rome*: But principally because, when an *Ecclesiastical*

cleſiaſtical Superior dyes there remains by *Chriſts Ordination* a [*vis generativa*] or virtue in the Church to conſtitute another in his place, and ſo to continue the *Government*. There has been oft times a long *vacancy* in the *Apoſtolic* See, as well as in *Dioceſes* and *Kingdoms*. After the death of *Pope Fabian* (before there were any *Chriſtian Emperors*) the *See* was *vacant* for above a years ſpace: yet neither did *St. Irenæus*, *Optatus*, *Epiphanius*, or *St. Auguſtin*, when they objected the chain of Succeſſion in *St. Peters* Chair, eſteem that thereby the Chain had been broken: neither did any old *Heretick* make uſe of ſuch an argument to invalidate the *Popes authority*.

16. But what ſhall we ſay to the *Doctors* next inference, in a caſe of *Schiſm? when there are many* Popes, *then*, ſays he, *the Church* is become a Monſter *with many Heads*. But he is deceived. As when, after the death of a *King*, ſeveral pretenders to the *Crown* appear, there is ſtill by right but one *legitimate Succeſſor*: all the reſt are *Rebels* and *Tyrants*. It is ſo in the Papacy. In that caſe *St. Cyprians* Rule holds, *If the Church be with* Novatian, *it was not with* Cornelius, *who by a lawful Ordination ſucceeded* Fabian. Novatian *therefore is not in the Church, nor can he eſteemed a Biſhop* (of *Rome.*) Or if it be uncertain to which of them the right pertains, ſo that ſome Nations adhere to one Head, others

Cypr. Epiſt. 76.

thers to another: it is a great calamity: but yet the *Church* remains, though wounded; yet not wounded to death: *A General Council* cures all.

17. If the *Pope*, (according to *Doctor Pierce* his supposition) *should* prove an *Heretic*, he infers very improperly, *that the Church hat such a Head as makes her deserve to be beheaded*: For in that case, the *Pope* is so far from remaining a *Head*, that he is not so much as a Member of the *Church*, but is deprived not only of the *Administration*, but also the *Communion of the Church*, as other *Heretical Bishops* are: So that then there is a pure *vacancy*. I shall not be so severe as to take notice of the unhansom (not to say unmannerly) terms the *Doctor* uses in expressing the last branch of this Objection.

18. Thus much concerning the *Doctors* first pretended *Novelty* of the *Roman Church*, the *Popes primacy*. Now whether my asserting that *Primacy* or his denying it to be a *Novelty*, and whether his *proofs* or mine are more concluding, I leave to the Readers consciences. He will excuse my dilating on this Point, because therein I follow his own example, for he tels *his Majesty*, *He has spoken most at large of the Popes supremacy* and his reasons given for such Largeness shall be mine too, though I believe we shall have different meanings, yet without equivocation, even when we deliver our *reasons* in the same words. For i. *I also acknow-*

Epist. Ded.

ledge

ledg the Popes *ſupremacy to be the chief, if not only hinge on which does hang the ſtreſs of* (more than Papal) *the Eccleſiaſtical Fabrick*, as being the *Cement* of the *Churches unity*. 2. *Becauſe it is a point wherein* (ſay I likewiſe) *the Honor and ſafety of his Majeſties Dominions are moſt concerned.* His meaning is, that no danger is to be apprehended for *England*, but only from that Point. I am ſure, on the contrary, that whilſt ſuch a *Primacy* purely ſpiritual was acknowledged in *England*, the *Church* here was never torn in pieces with *Schiſms*, nor poyſon'd with Hereſies: The *Throne* was never in the leaſt danger upon that account; never was a Sword drawn for or againſt it. Some few little more than Paper-quarrels hapned between the *Engliſh* and *Roman Court*, about matters, not of Religion, but outward Intereſts: in which generally the Pope had the worſt at laſt: But the *Honor* and *Safety* of theſe *Dominions* were far from being prejudiced. The *Kings* of *France* always have been, and ſtil continu as jealous and tender of their *temporal Regalities*, as ever any Princes were: yet they account it one of the moſt ſparkling Jewels of their Crown, that they call themſelves *the eldeſt* [and moſt devoted] *Sons of the Catholic Church*. The acknowledging the *Spiritual Primacy* of the chief *Paſtor* they find a greater honor and defence to them than many Armies would be: becauſe it preſerves peace and unity in that Kingdom, not by the terror of Ibid.

Swords drawn and Muskets charged in their Subjects faces, but by subduing their minds and captivating their consciences to *Faith* and *Obedience*. And let *Doctor Pierce* be assured, without a Spiritual Authority, which may have influence on the hearts of Christian Subjects, all their *preaching*, and *Laws* too will prove but shaking Bulwarks for supporting Monarchy.

19. But we must not yet leave this passage without considering it a little better. He saith, *That in the point of the Popes Supremacy of Jurisdiction the honor and safety of his Majesties Dominions are most concern'd*: his meaning is, that it is both *dishonorable* and *dangerous* to his *Majesties* Dominions, that any of His Subjects should be permitted to acknowledge such a *Supremacy*. I would I could oblige the *Doctor* by any *exorcisms* to discover sincerely the inward thoughts of his heart upon this Subject. But, having no such power, at so great a distance, I must be content to argue the Case with him once more, because it is a passage, that reflects not only upon the honor of *Catholick Religion*, but the safety of all *Professors* of it.

20. He cannot be ignorant, how often and how earnestly *Roman Catholicks* here have protested their renouncing any acknowledgement of the least degree of *Temporal power* or Jurisdiction as of Right to belong to the Pope, over any Subject of his *Majesties*,

It

It is therefore meerly a pure *Spiritual authority* that they acknowledge in their *Supreme Paſtor*. Is this now diſhonorable? Is it unfaſe? To whom? To all *Supreme Princes*, whether *Catholics*, or not? For *Catholic Princes*, they proteſt againſt this Opinion either of diſhonor or danger; If only then to other *Princes* or *States* which are diſſenters from, and enemies to Catholick Religion, then *Nero* and *Diocletian* had reaſon and juſtice on their ſides, when they perſecuted a *Religion diſhonorable* and *dangerous* to the *Roman Empire*: For evidently, neither St. *Peter*, nor any other *Apoſtle*, or *Biſhops*, but were, as to their Spiritual Authority, independent on the *Emperors*.

21. Nay more, let the Doctor himſelf conſider, leſt He and his, both Brethren and Fathers, the Biſhops, be not more deeply involved in the guilt, for which he deſires the Catholics only ſhould ſuffer. They themſelves acknowledge, in deſpite of ſo many Statutes to the contrary, a pure Spiritual Authority in their Biſhops, not derived from the King, they promiſe a Canonical obedience to them. they do not ſo to the King, therefore they admit a Juriſdiction in Biſhops, of which the King is not the Root. For tho' for example, a publick denunciation of Excommunication

Contrary to th Statute 37 *Hen.* 8. c. 17. — 67. *Ed.* 6. c. 2. — & *Reform. Leg. Eccleſiaſt.* c. *De Offic. & Juriſdictione*, p. 190.

in their Spiritual Courts: or the conferring of Orders, or determining points of Faith, &c. without the Kings consent may expose them, in case they exercise such Functions, to some danger from the Law of the Kingdom, yet they will justifie such acts to be in themselves valid, that is, perform'd with sufficient authority; See *Bishop Andrews* Tort. Tort p. 366. — *Bishop Carleton* of Jurisdict. Reg. & Episcop. c. 1. p. 9. — & c. 4. p. 39, 42. — *Bishop Bramh.* Schism guarded, p, 61, 63, 92. — Answer to *Bishop* of *Chalced.* p. 161. — *Doctor Ferns* Discovery of Episcopacy and Presbytery, p. 19. — *Doctor Tailor* Episcopacy asserted, p. 236, 237, 239, 243, — *Mr. Thornd.* Right of Ch. c. 4. p. 234. — Epilog. l. 1. c. 8. p. 54. — l. 1. c. 19, & 20. — l. 3. c. 32. Which Quotations if any intelligent Reader will take the pains to peruse and consider, he may clearly see what limitations they make in the sense of that Oath of Regal Supremacy, which Oath yet they freely take in the full latitude of its words, though these expresse not any of the said limitations. A matter, which hath not passed unobserved by *Mr. Thorndyke* in his *Just Weights*, c. 20. who there conceives great reason why the Kingdom for this should enact a new Oath.

22. But if I should address my Speech now to *Presbyterians* and their *Consistories*, the Case is far more evident. They are so far from permitting to the King a *Supremacy* of *Autho-*

Authority in their *Eccleſiaſtical Courts* (if ſuch *conſpiracies* may be called *Eccleſiaſtical*) that they will not ſo much as allow him any authority at all in ſuch tranſactions: Nay they will exempt him no more than his meaneſt Subject from ſubjection to them. The like may be ſaid of *other Sects*, which though they are not guilty of the *Presbyterian tyranny*, yet are as averſe from granting *his Majeſty* any *Supremacy* in matters of *Religion*, as either *Presbyterians*, *Proteſtants*, or *Roman Catholics*. But I am now to deal with the *Preacher* and his *Proteſtants*: I therefore deſire them to compare *themſelves* and *Roman Catholics* together as to this point of *honor* and *ſafety* to his Majeſty and his *Dominions*.

23. Is it diſhonorable either to the King or Kingdom, that a purely Spiritual authority ſhould be acknowledged in *him*, to whom this whole Kingdom from its firſt converſion to Chriſtianity together with the whole Chriſtian world ſubmitted it ſelf as to their *Supreme Paſtor*? And is it *Honorable*, that the *ſame authority* ſhould be granted to more than twenty of *his Majeſties* own *Subjects*? Again, is it *unſafe* that *Canonical obedience* for *Chriſtian Unity's* ſake ſhould be profeſſed to *one Venerable Prelat* a 1000. miles off, and is there *no danger* in making the ſame *Profeſſion* to ſo many at home, who, beſides their *ſpiritual authority*, have a right to concur in the enacting and executing *Civil laws* too; and

who, we see, can either exalt or depresse, according to their Interests, and advantages the *Royal Prerogative?*

24. To resolve such Questions, as these, but also so to resolve them as becomes a *Preacher* of the *Gospel of peace* and *truth* would be a subject worthy the stating in a *Court-Sermon*. But it must be don without transgressing the precise limits of the *question*, that is, by comparing the state of *Catholic Religion* as professed and practised, for example, in *France*, *Venice*, *Germany*, &c. with the reformed Religion in *England*; the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy of the former with that of the latter; and then judging whether of the two bring more security and honor to their Princes, and are more effectual upon the *consciences* of *Subjects* to breed them up in peace and obedience. For my own part, simply *as a Catholic*, my desire and prayers are, that Gods divine truth may prevail in all our hearts, but so prevail by those wayes of Charity, Patience, Justice and Piety with which it first conquered the World. And *as a Subject of the Crown of England* my Prayers are, that we may be all united in the profession of that only Religion, which more perfectly and most indispensibly *gives to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, and to God the things which are God's.*

25. I will row for a farewel, to these Testimonies of *our Catholic Fathers*, add the

Votes

Votes of the Fathers also of the Reformation, that he may see how far more ingenuously they write then himself has don touching the *Popes Primacy*. And first I will produce two or three, who, though they oppose it, as he does, as a *Novelty*, yet allow a far greater age to it. *Doctor Fulk* (most *unchronologically*) says, that *five or six hundred years before Pope* Leo *and Pope* Gregory (that is almost an hundred years before Christ was born) *the mystery of Iniquity wrought in the See of* Rome, *and then daily encreased; they were so deceived with long continuance of error, that they thought the dignity of* Peter *was much more over the rest of his fellow Apostles, then the Holy Scriptures do allow. Archbishop Whitgift* assures us, that *the Papal Supremacy began with St.* Peter, his words are, *Among the Apostles themselves there was one chief, that had chief authority over the rest, to the end Schisms might be compounded.* And this he quotes from *Calvin*, who said, *The twelve Apostles had one among them to govern the rest.*

Fulk *against* Bristows motives, *p.* 48.

Whitg. Defence, cap. 59.

Ibid. p. 173.

26. I will now produce two, who will give this whole Cause to the *Pope*. The first is the so fam'd *Melancthon*, who writes thus: *As certain Bishops preside over particular Churches, so the Bishop of* Rome *is President over all Bishops. And this Canonical policy no wise man, as I think, does or ought to disallow, &c. For the Monarchy of the Bishop of* Rome *is in my judgement profitable to this end, that consent*

Centur. Epist. Theol. Epist. 74.

of Doctrine may be retain'd. Wherfore an agreement may eaſily be eſtabliſhed in this Article of the Popes Supremacy, if other Articles could be agreed upon.

Covel. Exam. page 106, 107. The other witneſſe is learned Doctor Covel, the Defender of Mr. Hooker, he having ſhew'd the Neceſſity of ſetting up one above the reſt in God's Church to ſuppreſſe the Seeds of Diſſention, &c. thus applies it againſt the Puritans, If this were the principal means to prevent Schiſms and Diſſentions in the Primitive Church, when the graces of God were more abundant and eminent then now they are: Nay, if twelve [Apoſtles] were not like to agree, except there had been one chief among them: For ſaith Hierom, Among the twelve one was therefore choſen, that a chief being appointed, occaſion of Schiſm might be prevented; how can they think that equality would keep all the Paſtors in the World in peace and unity? For in all Societies, Authority, which cannot be where all are equal, muſt procure unity and obedience. He adds further: The Church without ſuch an Authority, ſhould be in a far worſe caſe then the meaneſt Common-wealth; nay almoſt then a Den of Theives; if it were left deſtitute of means, either to convince Hereſies, or to ſuppreſſe them; yea, though there were neither help nor aſſiſtance of the Chriſtian Magiſtrate. Thus Dr. Pierce may ſee how theſe, his own Primitive Reformers, either joyn with us in this Point of Primacy, or however they oppoſe him, in calling it a Novelty begun by Pope Boniface the third.

Ibid.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

Of the Churches Infallibility. The neceſsity thereof, that ſhe may be a certain Guide to Salvation; And the grounds whereupon She claims it.

1. THe *Second* pretended *Novelty* of Catholick Doctrine, is *the Infallibility of the Church, called* by the *Preacher, The Palladium of the Conclave, and derived from the Scholars of* Marcus *in* Irenæus, *or from the* Gnoſticks *in* Epiphanius. *Againſt which Infallibility* his unanſwerable *Arguments* are, 1. *Infallibility is one of Gods incommunicable Attributes.* 2. *The Church not being omniſcient, muſt therefore be ignorant in part, and conſequently may fall into Error.* 3. *It is confeſs'd by the great Champions of the* Papacy, *that the Hereſie of the* Novatians *was hatch'd in* Rome, *and continued there almoſt two hundred years.* 4. *Beſides* Arianiſm *that over-ſpread the Church, ſhe was infe-*

Serm. pag. 8.

Ib. page 22.

ted

tied with the Hereſie of the Chyliaſts, *being deceived by* Papias, *which Hereſie found no contradiction for ſome Ages. 5. Yea, the whole Church in the opinion of St.* Auguſtin *and Pope* Innocent, *(during the ſpace of ſix hundred years according to* Maldonat.*) thought the Sacrament of the Euchariſt neceſſary to Infants: yet the Council of* Trent *is of a contrary mind.*

32. In order to the anſwering of this *Diſcourſe*, he will ſure acknowledge that all Sects of Chriſtianity agree in this, that each of them has both a *Rule* of their Faith, and a *Guide* alſo. But in both theſe there is difference among them. To the *Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptiſts, Quakers, Socinians, &c.* the only *Rule* is the *Holy Scripture.* But both *Catholicks* and *Engliſh Proteſtants*, though they acknowledge *Divine Revelations* to be their only *Rule*, yet they admit certain univerſally received *Traditions*, beſides expreſſe *Scripture.*

33. But as for the *Guide* from which we are to learn the true ſenſe of this *Rule*, the difference among the ſaid Sects is far greater, and more irreconcilable. The *Socinians* will have Scripture interpreted onely by private *reaſon*, a *Guide* evidently *fallible*, and therefore not to be impoſed on others. The *Independents, Anabaptiſts, Quakers*, and *Presbyterians* too, pretend to an *Infallible Guide*, *Gods Holy Spirit*; but with this difference, that the *Independents, Anabaptiſts*, and *Quakers*, rationally acknow-

acknowledge that this *Guide* is only to direct those that have it, and perceive they have it, but cannot oblige other men that have it not, nor can be sure they have it. Whereas the *Presbyterians* by an unexampled *Tyranny* (at least in *France*) do oblige themselves and their Posterity to a Profession, that by a *Divine Illumination* they are taught to distinguish *Canonical Books* of *Scripture* from *Apocryphal*, and by the same *Guide* to justifie all the Doctrines by which they dissent from all others: And moreover, by a most senseless inhumanity, will impose a necessity on all others, to belie their own Consciences, and acknowledge the same *Guide*; though they have never wrought any Miracles, which certainly are necessary to oblige others to believe and follow the internal Guidance of that *Spirit* to which they pretend.

4. As for Dr. *Pierce*, and the generality of *English Protestants*, (I speak of them now, as hitherto they have bin, for what they must be hereafter, neither they nor I know) a special Guide of theirs, beyond *Reason* and *Spirit*, for the finding out the sense of *Scripture*, and judging of *Traditions* received by them, is the *Primitive Church*, or *foure first General Councils*: But since those ancient Fathers are now past speaking, and their Writings are as obnoxious to *disputes* as the *Scriptures* themselves, a speaking Judge of the sense of all these, I suppose, is their *Ecclesiastical* Sy-

nods,

nods, or *Bishops*, when *Synods* are dissolved: but principally those that are to make, and determine the sense of *Acts of Parliament*. And upon these grounds they finde themselves obliged to behave themselves differently to several adversaries. For against *Sects* that went out from them, they use the help of *Catholick* weapons, the *Authority of the Church, Councils &c.* But against *Catholicks*, they (renouncing the Authority of the present Church in her Supremest Councils, of convening which the times are capable, and (in the interval of Councils) in the major part of the Governours thereof united with him, whom themselves acknowledge the prime *Patriark*) will make use of a kind of private spirit or reason; or the judgment of a most inconsiderable number of *Church-Governors*, going against the whole Body of the *Catholick Church*, and their chief Pastor, but this, as to assent only, where it likes them, and so will be their own selves Judges of what is the sense of Councils, Fathers, Scriptures and all: And great difficultie they often find how to avoid being accounted *Papists*, when they speak to Sectaries, and being even *Fanaticks* when they Dispute with *Roman Catholicks*. And truly the *Doctors* whole *Sermon*, is in effect meerly *Fanatick*; For though he florish with Greek and Latin quotations of Fathers joynd to Scripture, which they do not; yet since there is no visible Judge talk'd of in it,

but

but himself, that is able to speak; What is this but *private spirit*, having a little measure of the gift of Tongues more than *Quakers* have? So that let them preach as much as they will, the result of all Dispute between them and us must come to this, *Whether their last speaking Judge in* England, *or ours in the whole Catholic Church, deserves better to be believ'd and rely'd on.*

5. It cannot be deny'd but that there is something of *Truth* in all these Sects. The *Guide* which each of them respectively layes claim to, is a justifiable Guide, though being alone not sufficient. For 1. To exclude *Reason* from guiding us, would be to become Beasts. 2. To exclude *Gods Spirit* from directing us, would be to cease being *Christians*. 3. To renounce the *Testimony of Antiquity*, and *Authority* of *General Primitive Councils*, would be an arrogant temerity unpardonable. 4. And last of all to deny a judging determining power to the present visible Governors, I mean those Governors and Synods which are Superior, in respect of all other Governors or Synods Inferior, would be to make all *Heresies* and *Schisms* justifiable. Therefore not any of these *partial Guides* must be neglected: Yet unless they all concur, that which we take to be *Reason*, and *Inspiration*, and the *sense of the Primitive Church* may deceive and mis-guide us.

6. Now, is is only the Roman Catholic Church,

Church, whose *entire* Guidance proceeds from all these, and the effect of which Guidance is full satisfaction to each mans Soul, and universal peace in Gods Church: which effects cannot possibly flow but from a complication of all these Guides. Roman Catholics admit *Reason* to judge of the sense of Scripture, (as the *Socinians* do:) but they give due bounds to Reason; nay they silence it quite, when it would presume to judge of incomprehensible Mysteries, and reject them because *Philosophy* cannot comprehend them. When Reason has found out the sense of Scripture, they with the *Presbyterians*, and even *Fanatics*, acknowledge it is *Divine Inspiration* that moves the Soul to assent thereto, and embrace the verities contained in Scripture, directing their actions accordingly. But because the Devil can transform himself into an Angel of Light, neither can there be any Guide more dangerous then false Inspirations, they conclude that all such pretended Inspirations are indeed Diabolical Suggestions, which are prejudicial to Honesty, Virtue, Piety, and the common Rules of Obedience, both Spiritual and Civil; All Inspirations which incite private, uncommission'd persons to reform either Churches or State; all that nourish Factions or Commotions in the Common-wealth: All that beget *Pride*, and an opinion of self-sufficiency, or an humor of censuring others, especially Superiors.

Superiors. In a word, whensoever *the spirit of single Prophets* refuse to be *subject to the community of the Prophets*, that is, Church Governors; such Inspirations in Catholic Religion are rejected, detested, and sent back to the Infernal Father of them.

7. Moreover, Roman Catholics do willingly and confidently appeal to the Primitive Church, the four first General Councils, and the holy Fathers. But universal experience demonstrating it impossible, that any writing can end a Debate between multitudes of persons interessed, and therefore not impartial or indifferent, *their last recourse* is to the *present visible Church*; which cannot declare her sense to us in any other way then as she is represented by her *Pastors* out of all Nations, that is, by a *General Council*. All Catholics, submiting to this Council, not their tongues only, but also their judgments, by following the Church thus with humility, shew, that they are guided both by *Reason*, *Inspiration*, and *Examples* of *Primitive Fathers*. Hence St. *Austin* sayes, *We receive the Holy Spirit if we love the Church, if we rejoice in the name of Catholics, and in the Catholic Faith.* And elsewhere, [*Contra rationem nemo sobrius, &c.*] *No sober man will admit an opinion against Reason, no Christian against Scriptures, no lover of peace and unity, against the Church.* And this only is the Guide that we say, and presently will demonstrate to be *infallible*.

8. Now

8. Now, that the *final Decision* of all Controverſies in Faith, can only be expected from ſuch a Guide, and conſequently that all Chriſtians under pain of damnation, are obliged never to contradict this Guide, and alwaies to aſſent when it requires, we are taught, not by Reaſon only, but God himſelf alſo, and this in the Law of *Moſes*. *The whole Nation of the Iews*, (ſaith St. *Auguſtin*) *was as it were one great Prophet*; the policie of their Church was the Scheme of the Chriſtian, to the twelve Princes of their Families anſwer'd the twelve Apoſtles, to the Seventy Elders the Seventy Diſciples, to the ſeveral Courts of Judgement, our Eccleſiaſtical Synods, to the great *Sanhedrim*, a general Council, and to the High Prieſt, our Supreme Paſtor. Now for our preſent purpoſe, the Ordinance that God made in the Jewiſh Church for deciding Controverſies about the Law, ran thus, *If there ariſe a matter too hard for thee in judge-*
Deut. 7, 8, 9. *ment, &c.* (that is, as we find in 2 *Chron.* 19. 8. *between blood and blood, between Law and Commandment, Statutes and Judgements, then ſhalt thou ariſe and get thee into the place which the Lord thy God ſhall chuſe: And thou ſhalt come to the Prieſts and Levites, and to the Judge that ſhall be in thoſe dayes, and enquire, and they ſhall ſhew thee the ſentence of Judgement, and thou ſhalt do according to the ſentence which they ſhall ſhew thee, &c. Thou ſhalt not decline from the ſentence to the right*

hand

hand or to the left. *The man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken to the Priest, or unto the Judge, even that man shall die, and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel.* Upon those words in this passage [*unto the Judge that shall be in those daies*] *Ainsworth*, out of the *Rabbins*, observes, that if the high *Synedrion* had determin'd of a matter, & after another *Synedrion* rose up, which (upon Reasons seeming good unto them) disannulled the former Sentence, then it was disannull'd, and Sentence passed according as seemed good to *those later*; So that the *present Authority* was alwaies to take place, and no *Appeals* to be made from it. For if any Disputes against the Sentence of *living speaking Judges*, upon any pretence whatsoever, either of a private exposition of the *Law*, or the Authority of preceding *Rabbies* were allow'd, there would never want Contentions and Schisms in the *Synagogue*. And observe that in this obedience was implyed an assent or submission of Judgment: For otherwise it would be against Conscience, in case the party continued in a contrary opinion of the sense of the Law. It is just so, and alwaies has been so in the *Catholic Church*: The present Superiors living and speaking must conclude all Controversies, their Interpretation of Scripture and Fathers, their Testimony of Tradition must more then put to silence all contradiction of particular Persons or Churches, it must also

Ainsworth in Deut. 17. 9.

subdue their minds to an assent, and this under the Penalty of an *Anathema*, or cutting off from the Body of Christ, which answers to a Civil death in the Law.

9. If then an Obedience so indispensable was required to *Legal Judges*, who might possibly give a wrong sentence; How securely may we submit our judgements to the *Supream Tribunal* of the *Church*: And how justly will an *Anathema* be inflicted on all gainsayers of an Authority that we are assured shall never mislead us? And the grounds of this assurance, which the Preacher is not yet perswaded of, are now to be discoverd.

10. The true grounds of the Churches Infallibility are the words of Truth, the Infallibility of the *promises of Christ*, the *Eternal wisdom* of the *Father*. These Promises are the true *Palladium*, not of the *Conclave*, but of the *Universal Church*: Nor do we think *Doctor Pierce* such an *Ulisses*, as to apprehend he can steal it away.

Serm. page 22. 11. We do not deny however, that *Infallibility and Omniscience are* (as he saies) *incommunicable Attributes of God*: It is God alone to whose *Nature* either lying or being deceived are essentially contrary, because he is essentially *immutable* as in his *Being*, so in his *Understanding* and *Will*. Yet the immutable *God* can preserve mutable Creatures from actual mutation: God, who is absolutely *Omniscient*, can teach a rational Creature all *Truths*

Truths neceſſary or expedient to be known: So that, though a man have much *ignorance*, yet he may be in a ſort *omniſcient* within a determinate *Sphere*, he may be exempted from ignorance or error in teaching ſuch ſpecial verities as God will have him know, and has promiſed he ſhall faithfully teach others. Our Saviour, as man, was certainly infallible, and as far as was requiſite, *omniſcient* too: So were the Apoſtles likewiſe, whoſe writings *Proteſtants* acknowledge both to be *infallible*, and to contain *all Truth* neceſſary to Salvation. Good Doctor, do you think it a contradiction that God ſhould beſtow an infallibility, as to ſome things, on a Creature? What did our Saviour give St. *Peter* when he ſaid, *I have prayed for thee that thy Faith fail not?* Thus the Doctor may ſee what a trifling Diſcourſe he has made againſt Gods Church.

12. Now, the *infallible promiſes* of *our Lord* to his Church, by vertue of which ſhe has alwaies been believed to be in our ſenſe *infallible*, follow: At leaſt as many of them as may ſuffice for the preſent purpoſe. 1. *Our Saviour* has promiſed his Apoſtles, *That he would be preſent with them alwaies to the end of the World*: Therefore ſince not any of them out-liv'd that age, this infallible promiſe muſt be made good to their *Succeſſors*. 2. He has promiſed that *When two or three of them meet together in his Name, he will be in the midſt of them*; Surely to direct them. Therefore much Math. 28. 20. Math. 18. 20.

more when the whole Church is representatively assembled about his business onely. 3. *He has promised that he will lead his Church into all Truth*; at least all that is necessary or but expedient for them to know. 4. He has promised, that *Against his Church, built upon St.* Peter, *the Gates of Hell* (that is *Heresie*, say the Fathers) *shall not prevail*: Therefore it shall be infallibly free from *Heresie*. 5. He has commanded that, *Whoever shall not obey his Church, shall be* (cut off from his Body) *as a Heathen and a Publican*: Therefore *Anathema's* pronounced by his Church are valid. Our Lord indeed speaks of Decisions made by a particular Church in quarrels among Brethren: Therefore if Disobedience to such Decisions be so grievously punished, what punishment may we suppose attends such as are disobedient to Decisions of the Universal Church, (call'd by the Apostle, *The Pillar and ground of Truth*) made for the composing of publick Debates about the common Faith. 6. To conclude, the belief of the *Churches Unity* is an unchangable *Article* of our *Creed*: Therefore certainly the onely effectual mean to preserve Unity, (which is an un-appealable, and infallible Authority) shall never be wanting in the Church.

Math. 16. 18.

Math. 18. 17.

All

13. All theſe Texts and Promiſes we by the example of the Holy Fathers and Authority of Tradition, produce as firm Grounds of an *Infallibility* in the Univerſal Church repreſentative, which has an influence over the Souls of men, requiring much more than an external ſubmiſſion, which yet is all that *Proteſtants* will allow to the moſt authentic general Councils. We hope now *Doctor Pierce* will not fly to *Mr. Chillingworths* miſerable ſhift, and ſay that all theſe *Promiſes* are only conditional and depending on the piety of Church-governors: For this is contrary to the aſſertion of all *Antiquity*, which from theſe *Promiſes* argues invincibly againſt all *Heretics* and *Schiſmatics*, who might otherwiſe, on *Mr. Chillingworths* ground, alledge (as the *Donatiſts* did) that the Church by the ſins of ſome had loſt all her Authority, and that Gods ſpirit was tranſplanted from her into themſelves. Nor yet that he will uſe the plea of ſeveral other Proteſtant Writers ſomwhat more diſcreet, who are willing to allovv thoſe Promiſes abſolute, and to belong alſo to the Guides of the Church ſom or other, that they ſhall in all ages continue orthodox, but not alvvayes to the more ſuperior, or to the greater bodies of theſe aſſembled in Councils (becauſe, thus, they ſee their cauſe will ſuffer by it.) But this plea alſo is utterly unſatisfying; For whenever the ſuperior and ſubordinate Church-Officers, or Eccleſiaſti-

cal Courts shall contradict or oppose one another, here the superior questionlesse is to be our Guide (otherwise we have no certain rule to know who is so) and therefore to these, not the other, in such cases, must belong these promises, where they cannot possibly agree to both.

14. These promises now being *Yea and Amen*, the *Doctor* must not seem to make our Lord passe for a Deceiver, but apply them to his English Protestant Church, since he will not allow them to the Catholic, for to some Church they must be applyed. But let him consider withal, he must condemn St. Greg. M. l. 1. Epist. 24. *Gregory, who professed that he venerated the four first General Councils of the Catholic Church, as the four Gospels.* He must condemn Act. Conc. Nicen. *Constantine*, who, in the *first Council of Nice* professed, that [πάντα ὅσα ἔκρινάν, &c] *whatever is decreed in the holy Councils of Bishops, that ought to be attributed to th Divine will* In a word he must by condemning all the *General Councils* of Gods Church, condemn likewise (which is more dangerous) the *Act of Parliament*, 1 *Eliz.* For manifest it is that all the *Fathers* in those *Councils* did pronounce many *Anathema's* against all those that would not submit to a belief of such and such *Decisions* of theirs, in some of which were new expressions not extant in Scripture, but devised by the Fathers then present, as the words ὁμοούσιος, Θεοτόκος, &c. Now I ask *Doctor*

Pierce,

Pierce, were those *Anathema's* lawfull? were they valid? Or will he say, those first Councils (to which he professes assent) usurped an Authority in this, not of right belonging to them? If those *Anathema's* were valid, then the *Councils* had a just authority to oblige Christians to an *internal belief* of verities declared by them, as the sence of Divine Revelation, and this, under the penalties of being separated from Christ: And can any Authority but such as is *infallible* lay such an obligation upon Consciences under such a penalty? But, if those *Anathema's* were illegal and invalid, then were the *Fathers* both of those *Councils* and of All others, who still followed the same method, not only impostors, but most execrable *Tyrants* over the Souls of men.

15. These *Deductions* surely are more effectual to demonstrate the *Churches* infallibility, than any of his *Quotations* can be against it: Here we have expresse Scripture, and universal consent of *Antiquity*: Nay here we have the concession of the more judicious Writers of the Church of *England* (at least before their late restitution:) who seem to agree that in the Controversies between our Church and theirs, they would certainly submit to a future lawful *General Council*: Now, could they lawfully make such a Promise and think such a *Council* could misguide them? Therefore truly I cannot have the uncivility to judge, that, when one of your 39. *Articles* declares, *that*

Dr. Hamond *of Heresy. sect.* 9. *n.* 1 *sect.* 11. 15. *sect.* 13. *n.* 2. *sect.* 14. *n.* 6. Bishop Bramhall Reply to Bishop Chalced Preface and Vindic. ca. 2. p. 9.

Artic. 19. *some General Councils have err'd*, the meaning should be that any legal, legitimate *General Council* has err'd; but only som Councils that som *Roman Catholics* esteem to be *General*, concerning which the *Church of England* is of another opinion: And if this be the meaning, the breach made by it may be curable.

16. Now whereas the Doctor alleages, as
Serm p. 11. against this Point, *the concession of Baronius, &c. that Novatianism was hatch'd and continued two hundred years at* Rome. I cannot devise how to frame an *Objection* out of it: Can no Church be *Orthodox*, if *Heretics* rise and continue in the same *City*? Is the *English Church* a *Quaking Church*, because *Quakers* first began, and still encrease at *London*? As for *Novatians* at *Rome* he cannot deny but they were so far from being Members of the *Roman Church*, that they were continually esteem'd *Heretics* and condemned by it.

17. The like we say touching the *Donatists*.
Ibid. Indeed his objecting the *Arians* has more appearance of reason and sense [*Ingemuit orbis,*
Hieron. *&c.*] *The world* (says St. *Hierom*) *sadly groaned and was astonished to see it self on a sudden becom Arian*,, that is, after the *Council* of *Ariminum*. But how was it *Arian*, if it *groaned*? &c. for it could not be really *Arian* against its will. But St. *Hierom* uses this expression, because the great *Council* of *Ariminum* had seem'd to favour the *Arian* party against the Catho-

Catholics. And true it was, that Catholic Biſhops were indeed perſecuted, and many baniſh'd: But not one of them chang'd their Profeſſion of the *Nicene* Faith, unleſſe you will accuſe Pope *Liberius*, who for a while diſſembled it, and preſently repented. Beſides, the *Canons* at firſt made in that *Council* were perfectly *Orthodox*, but afterwards by the *Emperors Tyranny*, and ſubtilty of two or three *Arian Biſhops* a *Creed* was compoſed, wherein though the *Nicene Faith* was not ſufficiently expreſſed, Yet there was not one *Article* perfectly *Arian*, but capable of a good ſenſe: to which many Catholic Biſhops out of fear ſubſcribed, yet to nothing but what in their ſenſe was true, though defective in delivering all the truth; but preſently after, being at liberty, both themſelves and all the reſt renounced. And after all, there remained but three years of perſecution, for after that time the *Arian* Emperour *Conſtantius* dyed.

18. Next concerning the objected Hereſy of the *Millenaries:* It is very unjuſt and a great irreverence in him to charge upon the Primitive Church the ſayings of two *Fathers:* and though one of them ſays, *All that were purely Orthodox*, (that is, ſuch as he eſteemed ſo, becauſe they were of his Opinion) *held that Doctrin*, yet he thereby ſhews, that his own Opinion was not univerſally embraced by the Church: But the truth is, there was a double

Mille-

Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 3. Hierom. Aug. l. 2. de Civ. D. c. 7.

Millenary opinion, the one that interpreted the reign of *Martyrs* with Christ for a thousand years, in base, sensual pleasures, banquets, and women: This was the Doctrine of the unclean *Heretick Cerinthus*, as *Eusebius* and St. *Augustin* relate: Against this St. *Dionysius Bishop* of *Alexandria* wrote an elegant Book, as St. *Hierom* affirms: And it is most deservedly detested by the Church. But there was another Opinion, that the *Martyrs should reign a thousand years with Christ in all Spiritual delights*, and ravishing consolation, in a blessed conversing with him: And this Opinion might not unbecom *Papias*, St. *Irenæus*, and St. *Justin Martyr*: For St. *Augustin* and St. *Hierom* both professe themselves unwilling to censure it, neither can the Doctor, I believe, shew that it was ever condemned by the Church.

Aug Ibid. Hieron. l. 4.

18. To his last Objection touching the *communicating of Infants*, it is granted that in St. *Augustin* and *Pope Innocent's* time, and many years after, such was the common practise of the Church to communicate them *Sacramentally* (but withal take notice, it was onely in *one species*.) Again, it is confessed that from that Text [*Nisi manducaveritis carnem, &c.*] St. *Augustin*, &c. argue a necessity that *Infants* should participate of the flesh and blood of our Lord, but this *not Sacramentally*, but *Spiritually*, by such a participation as may be had in *Baptism*.

Aug. l. 1. de pec. merit. cap. 20. Innocent in Epist.

This

This appears firſt, From the conſtant Doctrine of St. *Auguſtin*, &c. the whole Church affirming that, *Baptiſm alone may ſuffice to the ſalvation of Infants.* 2. From his interpreting his own meaning, in a Sermon quoted by St. *Beda* and *Gratianus*. His words are theſe, *None ought by any waies to doubt but that every Chriſtian by being made a Member of Chriſt in Baptiſm, thereby becomes partaker of the Body and Blood of our Lord, and that he is not eſtranged from a Communion of that Bread and Chalice, though being ſetled in the Unity of Chriſts Body, he ſhould depart out of this World, before he really eat of that Bread, and drink of that Chalice. For he is not deprived of the participation and benefit of the Sacrament, whenſoever that is found in him which is ſignified by the Sacrament.*

Aug. lib. c. 19. 21, 22. & lib. 2. cap. 28. &c.

Bed. ad 1 Cor. c. 10. Gratian de Conſecr. diſt. 2. cap. *Qui poſſit eſt.*

19. That therefore which the Church ſince, and particularly the *Council of Trent* alter'd in this matter, was nothing at all touching *Belief*: For all Catholicks this day believe St. *Auguſtin's* Doctrine in that Point, but onely an external practiſe of the Church: And this was done out of a wonderful reverence to thoſe *Holy Myſteries*, which by frequent *Communions of Infants* could not eſcape many irreverences and inconveniencies. And many ſuch Alterations even the Engliſh Church obſerves and juſtifies, both in the adminiſtring of the *Euchariſt* and *Baptiſm* too.

To conclude this matter: For a further proof

proof that these two instances about the *Millenary Belief*, and *Infant Communion* are not at all conducing to the Doctors Design, I will refer him to the Judgment of Doctor *Ferne*, of some weight no doubt with him, who expresly saies, and proves by Reasons not unlike these, *That nothing can be concluded by those two Instances to the prejudice of the whole Church, as if thereby might be proved that the whole Church, Universally, and in all the Members of it, may be infected with Error in Points of concernment or prejudicial to the Faith.*

Dr. *Fern* in certain Consid. in Preface.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

Of Prayer for the Dead. Its Apoſtolic antiquity. Purgatory neceſſarily ſuppoſed in it. The Doctor's Objections anſwer'd.

1. HAving treated ſo largely of the Preachers two pretended *Novelty's*; 1. the *Primacy of Juriſdiction of the See Apoſtolic*; and 2. the *Infallability of the Church in her General Councils*, I might rationally enough neglect examining the following particular Dogma's which he likewiſe charges with *Novelty*, and betake my ſelf to the point of *Schiſm*: becauſe if the Church have a ſpiritual *obliging Juriſdiction*, taking its *Original* from the Chair of St. *Peter*; and again if what ſhe propoſes to us to be believed, ſhe propoſes validly under the penalty of being ſeparated from Chriſt, ſince it is manifeſt that ſhe ſo propoſes the ſaid particular Doctrins, not in her Councils onely, but univerſal practiſe, wherein her Infallability is with an equal Authority

Authority demonstrated; they ought without contradiction be submitted to: Nevertheless having some reason to doubt that in case any of his *Novelties* be omited, he, or at least some of his over-credulous *Readers* will impute such an omission to a difficulty in disproving him, I must be content to take a trouble on me, which is therefore only necessary, because many Protestants are unreasonable.

2. His *third* pretended *Novelty*, is the *Doctrin of Purgatory*, which he says, *We have from* Origen, *or at the furthest from* Tertullian, *and he from no better Author than the Arch-Heretic* Montanus. *Nor does* Bellarmin *mend the matter by deriving it from* Virgil, Tully, *or* Plato's Gorgias. Serm. p. 8.

3. It would have been a great courtesie both to his *Hearers* and *Readers*, if he had inform'd them why he singled out a speculative Point touching *Purgatory*, and omited one of far greater importance, because obliging to Practise also, which is *Prayer for the Dead*. His way of proceeding, doubtlesse does not want a *Mystery*: And he must give me leave to answer his *Novelty* of *Purgatory* by speaking scarce any thing at all of it, but only telling him nakedly the Churches Doctrin about it; and by insisting on the confessed Antiquity, *Apostolic Antiquity* of *Prayer for the Dead*; which being cleared, I defie all his learning and skill, unless he can dis-

disprove this, to deny or so much as question the other.

4. Now the *Doctrin* of the *Church* concerning *Purgatory* and *Prayer for the Dead* is contained in this *Decree* of the *Council of Trent*, *There is a Purgatory: and Souls detained there are helped by the ſuffrages of the Faithfull*, (that is, by *Prayers* and *Alms*) *and moſt eſpecially by the moſt acceptable Sacrifice of the Altar.* By which Definition the Church obliges all Catholicks no farther than ſimply to believe that there is a place or ſtate of Souls in which they are capable of receiving help or eaſe by Prayers, &c. The Council tells us nothing of the poſition of this place, nor what incommodities Souls find in it, nor whether there be fire, &c. which are Points that *St. Auguſtin* ſays he could not reſolve: On the contrary, *it forbids*, (at leaſt out of the Schools) *all curious ſubtile Queſtions concerning it, all diſcourſes which are not for edification.* Concil. Trid. Seſs. 25. Ibid.

5. Having repreſented the Churches Doctrine, I will next tranſcribe the Form of her Prayers for the Dead, extant in the *Canon* of the *Maſſe*. *Remember likewiſe, O Lord, thy Servants who have gone before us with the Sign of Faith* (i. e. Baptiſm,) *and repoſe in the ſleep of peace. We beſeech thee, O Lord, mercifully grant to them, and to all that reſt in Chriſt, a place of refreſhment, light and peace, through Chriſt our Lord.* And after the Canon, *We beſeech thee, O Lord, abſolve the Soul of thy Ser-* Can. Miſſæ. Memento.

vant

Post Commun. *vant from all chains of his sins, to the end, that in the glory of the Resurrection, he may respire by a new life among thy Saints and Elect, through Christ our Lord.* Now if it can be demonstrated that by the universal practise of the *Primitive Church*, such Prayers as these were made for the *Dead*; it unavoidably follows, That the Souls for whom they are made, are neither in Heaven nor Hell: And if so, where are they, Doctor *Pierce?* speak like an honest man.

6. To demonstrate this, let him view narrowly these passages of the *Holy Fathers*, before, and during the space of the *first four General Councils*. *St. Denis* the *Areopagite*, (or whoever was Author of the Book of the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, and who by confession of *Protestants*, liv'd within the second Century after the Apostles) declares that *the Priest does demand from the Divine goodnesse for the person departed, a pardon of all sins through human frailty committed by him, and that he may be conducted into the light and region of the living, into the bosoms of* Abraham, Isaac, *and* Jacob, *into a place from which grief, sadnesse, and mourning is banished.* And presently after he testifies, that *What he commits to writing concerning this Prayer pronounced by the Priest for the Dead, he received by Tradition from his Divine Teachers* (the Apostles.)

Dion. Ar. de Eccles. Hierarchia. c. ult.

Ibid.

7. Next *Tertullian*, *Let the faithful Widdow*, saies he, *pray for the soul of her Husband,*

Tert. de Mon. cap. 10.

and

and make an oblation in the Anniversary day of his death, begging for him refreshment and part in the first Resurrection. And, to prevent the Preachers Objection, that the Father learned this from the *Arch-Heretick Montanus*, let him answer for himself; *We make*, saies he, *Anniversary Oblations for the Dead, and for the* [*Natalitia*] *of the Martyrs.* And presently he adjoynes, *Concerning these and the like Observances, if you require the Authority of Scriptures, you will not find any: Tradition shall be alleged to you for the Author, custom for the confirmer, and Faith the Observer.* Id. de Coron. Mil. cap. 3. Ibid. cap. 4.

8. After him follows his Schollar blessed St. *Cyprian*, *The Bishops* (saies he) *that went before us, have ordain'd that not any one of our Brethren at his death shall name in his Will for an Executor, or Guardian, any Ecclesiastical Person; and if any one shall do otherwise, that no Oblation should be made for him, and that the Sacrifice should not be celebrated for him at his death: For such a one deserves not so much as to be named at the Altar in the Priests Prayer.* Cypr. Ep. 66.

9. *Eusebius* relates that, at the Obsequies of the Emperor *Constantine*, *the People and Clergy unanimously sent up prayers to God, not without tears and great groanings for the Soul of the Emperor.* Likewise *Epiphanius* disputing against the *Heretick Aerius*, reckons this among his heresies (as St. *Augustin* likewise does) *That he denyed Prayers and Oblation for the Dead.* In opposition whereto he saies, Euse. de vit. Const. l. 4. c. 71. Epiph. 3. hæres.

Prayers made for the dead profit them, though they do not blot out [τὰ ὅλα τῶν ἐγκλημάτων] *entirely all (mortal) sins.* And again, *Who shall now have the boldneſſe to diſſolve the Statute of his Mother (the Church) or the Law of his Father?* (which Father he there interprets to be the Holy Trinity.) Moreover St. *Chryſoſtome*, *It is not in vain that the Apoſtles have inſtituted this Law, That during the celebration of the dreadful myſteries, commemoration ſhould be made of the dead: for they knew that great benefit and profit would thereby accrew unto them.* And yet more expreſly in another place, *We muſt* (ſaith he) *give our help and aſſiſtance to ſinners departed, by our Prayers, Supplications, Alms, and Oblations: For theſe things were not raſhly and groundleſly deviſed: Neither is it in vain, that in the Divine Myſteries we make mention of theſe who are dead; and approaching to the Altar, addreſſe our prayers for them to the Lamb placed there who took away the ſins of the World: But we do this to the end that ſome comfort and refreſhment may come to them thereby. Neither is it in vain that he who aſſiſts at the Altar at the time when the dreadful Myſteries are communicated, cries out, Pray for all that are dead in Chriſt, and for thoſe who celebrate their memorials. For were it not that ſuch commemorations were profitable to them, ſuch things would not be ſpoken. For the matters of our Religion are no ſport: No, God forbid. Theſe things are perform'd by the Order and Direction of Gods Spirit.*

Ibid.

Chryſoſt. in Ep. ad Philip. c. 1. hom. 3.

Id. hom. in 1 Cor. c. 15. v. 46.

10. *True*

10. True it is, that anciently in the publick Liturgies a commemoration was made even of the greateſt Saints, yea, and prayers were made for them: But yet not ſuch prayers as were made for the imperfect. But, ſince all future things may be the ſubject of our prayers, it may become our charity to pray for acceſſion of glory to Saints already glorified, but which at the Reſurrection ſhall be in a yet better State. And therefore when St. *Auſtin* ſaies, *It is an injury to pray for a Martyr, ſince we ought rather to commend our ſelves to his prayers*: he means ſuch prayers, as we make for imperfect Chriſtians, that is, for remiſſion of their ſins, refreſhment, &c.

11. Now, tho' ſome ſuch prayers extant in the *Holy Fathers* did regard the day of Judgment, and the glory enſuing; yet withal, that they thought, to ſome Souls a preſent refreſhment did accrew in the intermediat condition, is evident both by the foreſaid Teſtimonies, and many more that may be added: As where St. *Ambroſe* ſaies, he would never ceaſe his Interceſſions for the Soul of the dead Emperor? till he found a deliverance by them. This is ſo apparent both out of the Fathers and ancient Liturgies, that *Biſhop Forbes*, *Spalato*, and other Proteſtant Writers, do acknowledge it, and refuſe not to aſſent to the ground of ſuch a practiſe. The words of *Spalato* are theſe: *There would be no abſurdity if we ſhould confeſſe, that*

Forb. de Purg. c. 3. §. 27.

Spal. l. 5. cap. 8.

ſome lighter ſins which have not in this life been remitted (quoad culpam) *as to the guilt or fault, may be forgiven after death, and this ſomtimes a little after the departure of the Soul, &c. by vertue of the Churches interceſſion.*

12 It cannot be denied, but that there are among the Holy Fathers great varieties of Opinions touching ſome particular circumſtances regarding the ſtate of Souls after death, and at the preſent ſome differences there are between the Roman and Greek Church. In which notwithſtanding it will appear to any who will compare them, that the Roman Doctrin is far more moderate, receiveable, and approaching to the grounds of Proteſtants, than that of the Eaſtern Church. But however, it is without all controverſy, that all Churches who profeſſed Chriſtianity before the Reformation, do agree unanimouſly in the practice of praying for the Dead, ſo as to beg forgiveneſs of ſins, a bettering of their ſtate, an aſſwagement of their ſufferings, &c. Which practiſe they eſteem not a voluntary offering, but a duty, to a neceſſary performance of which, charity obligeth all Chriſtians. And therefore Engliſh Proteſtants cannot be excuſed for their neglect of this duty, eſpecially conſidering that the Doctrin upon which this Practice is grounded, is not mentioned at all among thoſe Points which they account Novelties

velties in the Roman Church. On the contrary, the more learned among them have and do, though not in expreſſion, yet in ſenſe agree with Biſhop *Andrews*, conceding in his Reply to *Cardinal Perron*, —— *That for offering* [doth he not mean here, for offering the Chriſtian ſacrifice of the Holy Eucharift for them, for what is more manifeſt in Antiquity, than this ?] *and prayer for the Dead, little is to be ſaid againſt it. No man can deny, but it is very antient.* Since then the Church cannot be thought, from the moſt antient times thereof, to have offered up to God all her prayers in all ages *pro defunctis* in vain, methinks I cannot here, but in this reſpect alſo commiſerate the condition of thoſe poor Souls, who depart hence un-owned by that Church, and without any ſhare in her prayers (which only like a true Mother, is ſo ſollicitous and careſull a Supplicant not only for her living, but alſo deceaſed children) and who, after a life here not ſo well ſpent, ſeeing themſelves going hence only with an inchoated repentance, & an unperfect reformation, and very unprepared to be immediatly entertained in that place of bliſs, and glorious ſociety into which no impure thing ſhall enter, yet are content rather to loſe the benefit of the daily prayers and oblations for them of this careful Mother, than to render themſelves capable thereof by returning into her Communion. And ſurely much more uncomfort- P. 9.

able must such a death be, that is void of the hopes of any such assistance, than theirs is, who, departing hence in the bosom of the Church, and in this blessed communion of Saints with the request of St. *Austins* dying Mother in their mouth, *Illud vos rogo, ut ad Dominæ altare memineritis mei: This I beg of you, that at the Altar of our Lord ye make remembrance of me:* are sure to enjoy the last aid of this pious charity, and also the yet more efficacious sacrifice of the Altar to be frequently offered to God in their behalf.

Aug. Conf. l. 9. c. 11.

10. Lastly, to omit particular Quotations out of the antient *public Liturgies* of the *Church*, that of St. *James* acknowledged by the *second General Council*, that of *St. Basil*, *St. Chrysostom*, *&c.* in every one of which are expresse prayers and oblations for the Dead, demanding pardon of their sins, refreshment of their sufferings, &c. I will conclude with a full convincing Testimony of St. *Augustin*, whose words are these, *That by the Prayers of the Holy Church, and saving Sacrifice, as likewise by Alms expended for their Souls, our departed Brethren are helped, that God may deal with them more mercifully than their sins deserve, not to be doubted. For this the universal Church observes as a Tradition of our Fathers, that for those who are dead in the Communion of the Body and Blood of our Lord, Prayers should be made, when at the holy Sacrifice their Names are in their due place rehearsed,*

Aug. Ser. 32. de verb. Apost. d

and

and that it ſhould be ſignified that the Offering is made for them. And when out of an intention of commending them to Gods mercy, works of Chatity and Alms are made, who will doubt that theſe things help towards their good, for whom Prayers are not in vain offered to God? It is not therefore to be doubted but that theſe things are profitable for the Dead, yet only ſuch as before their death have lived ſo, as that theſe things may profit them after Death. And again, *For Martyrs the Sacrifice is offered at a thanksgiving, and for others as a propitiation.* Id. Enchirid. c. 110.

14. The Doctor cannot but know in his Conſcience, (for he is no Stranger to the *Fathers*) what a great Volume may be written to confirm this: And that not one expreſſion can be quoted againſt it. Therefore whereas he ſaid without any ground, that *Tertullian borrowed from Montanus*; I would aſk him, From whom did he borrow the omiſſion of this charitable duty to the *Dead*, but from the *Heretic Aerius*? Nor is this to be conſidered as a voluntary courteſie don them, which without any fault may be omitted. On the contrary *St. Epiphanius* will tell him, *the Church does theſe things neceſſarily, having received ſuch a Tradition from the Fathers.* And *St. Auguſtin*, *we muſt by no means omit neceſſary Supplications for the Souls of the Dead: For whether the Fleſh of the dead Perſon lye here, or in another place, repoſe ought to be obtained to his Spirit.* Epiph. l. 3. hær. 75. Aug. de cur. pro mort. c. 5.

14 15. If

15. If these Souls were believ'd to be in *Heaven* would it not be ridiculous? If in *Hell* would it not be impious to offer the dreadful Sacrifice, to make Supplications, to be at charge in Alms for the obtaining them repose, pardon of their sins, refreshment of their sufferings, a translation into the region of Light and peace, and a place in the bosom of *Abraham?* But if they be neither in Heaven nor Hell, where are they then? He cannot deny a third place, unless he thinks them anihilated: He will not say that third place is *Purgatory*, because the Church calls it so. But suppose the Church dispence with him for the Name, I would to God he would accept of such a dispensation; one pretence of *Schism* would quickly be removed.

16. To conclude; If all the *Liturgies* of the Church, all the *Fathers* have not credit enough with him to perswade that this is no *Novelty*, yet greater *Antiquity* for it he may find in the *Jewish Church*: an expresse Testimony for which we read in the *Book* of *Macchabees*; He will say it is not Canonical: at least let him acknowledge it not to be a *Romance*: and however, the universal *Tradition* and practise of the *Synagogue* will justifie it. From the Jews no doubt *Plato* borrowed this Doctrin, and from *Plato Cicero*, and from both *Virgil*. Nay even natural reason will tell him, that Heaven, *into which no unclean thing can enter*, is not so quickly and easily o-

pen

pen to imperfect Souls, as to perfect: nor have we any sign, that meerly by dying, sinful livers becom immediatly perfect.

17. To fill his learned Margins, he quotes certain *Contradictors* of *Bellarmin*, as the *Bishop of Rochester*, *Polydor Virgil*, *Suarez*, and *Thomas ex Albiis*, but since both *Bellarmin* himself and all his Contradictors agree with the Church, in contradiction to the Preacher, that *there is a Purgatory*; what other inducement could he have to mention them, unlesse it were that his *Readers* might see what his *Hearers* could not, that he was resolved to pretend, but was not able indeed to produce any thing to purpose against the Catholic Church?

CHAP.

CHAP. XI.

Of Transubstantiation, or a Substantial Presence of our Lords Body in the Sacrament. Justified by the Authorities of the Fathers, &c. The Preacher's Objections Answer'd.

1. THe three next supposed *Novelties* of the *Catholic Church* all regard the most holy *Sacrament*. That blessed *Mystery*, which was instituted to be both a *Symbal* and instrument, to signifie and to operate *Unity*, is, by the cunning of the Devil, and malicious folly of men, becom both the work and cause of *Dis-union*.

2. Touching this Subject the first of the three *Novelties* the *Doctor* says is *Transubstantiation* "So far from being from the be-
Serm. p. 9. Ibid. p. 23, 24. "ginning that it is not much above four hun-
"dred years old, that it was first heard of in
"the Council of *Lateran*. For in Pope *Ni-*
"*cholas* the Second's time the submission of
"*Be-*

" *Berengarius* imports rather a *Con*— then " Tranſubſtantiation. *But evident is it, That* " *it was never taught by our Saviour*, ſince he " in the ſame breath wherewith he pro- " nounced, *This is my Blood*, explain'd himſelf " by calling it expreſly *the fruit of the Vine*. " and there needs no more to make the *Roma-* " *niſts* aſhamed of that Doctrin, than the con- " ceſſion of *Aquinas*, who ſays, That it is im- " poſſible for one body to be locally in more " places than one: From whence *Bellarmin* " angrily infers, that it equally implies a Con- " tradiction for one body to be ſo much as Sa- " cramentally in more places than one.

3. In order to the giving ſome ſatisfaction touching this matter, I will, as before, ſet down the *Churches Doctrin* concerning this moſt holy *Sacrament*, which will extend it ſelf to all his *three* pretended *Novelties*. In the *Profeſſion of Faith* compiled by *Pope Pius* iv. out of the *Council of Trent* it is ſaid, *I profeſs that in the Maſſe there is offered to God a true proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the living and Dead: And that in the moſt holy Sacrament of the Euchariſt there is truly and Subſtantially the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt: and that there is a Converſion* (or Change) *of the whole Subſtance of Bread into his Body, and of Wine into his Blood: which change the Catholic Church calls Tranſubſtantiation. Moreover I confeſs that under one of the Species alone whole* Profeſs. Fid. Pii 4.

whole and entire Christ, and a true Sacrament is received.

4. And if he will needs have it so, let it be granted, that the Latin word *Transubstantiation* begun commonly to be received among *Catholics* at the *Council of Lateran*: Though there was a Greek expression exactly importing as much [*μετουσίωσις*] as old as his *Beginning*, that is, in the time of the first *General Council*. But for God's sake let not a new word drive him out of God's Church, as the word *Ὁμοούσιον* did the *Arians*. He may observe with *Cardinal Perron* that the Church only says, the change made in the holy Sacrament *is usually called Transubstantiation*: So that on condition he allow a real Substantial change, the word it self shall not hinder us from being good Friends.

5. The *Doctor* sees now what our Church holds concerning this Point. She delivers her mind sincerely, candidly, ingenuously. But if I should ask him what his Church holds, it would cost him more labour to give a satisfactory Answer than to make ten such Sermons.

6. There are among *Christians* only *four ways* of expressing a *presence* of *Christ* in the *Sacrament*. 1. That of the *Zuinglians*, *Socinians*, &c. who admit nothing at all real here; *The Presence*, say they, is only figurative or imaginary: As we see Bread broken and eaten, &c. so we ought to call to mind that

Christs

that *Christs Body* was *crucified*, and torn for us, and by Faith (or a strong fancy) we are made partakers of his Body, that is, not his Body, but the blessings that the offring his Body may procure. 2. That of *Calvin* and *English Divines*, who usually say, as *Calvin* did, *That in the holy Sacrament our Lord offers unto us not onely the benefit of his Death and Resurrection, but the very Body it self in which he dyed and rose again:* Or, as *King James, We acknowledge a presence no lesse true and real then Catholics do; only we are ignorant of the manner*: [Of which it seems he thought that Catholics were not.] So that this *presence* is supposed a *Substantial presence*, but after a spiritual manner: A presence not to all, but to the worthy receivers: Offred perhaps to the unworthy, but only partaken by the worthy: A *presence* not to the *Symbols*, but the *Receivers Soul* only: Or if (according to Mr. *Hooker*) in some sence the *Symbols* do exhibit the *very Body* of *Christ*, yet they do not contain in them what they exhibit, at least not before the actual receiving. 3. Of the *Lutherans*, who hold *a presence of Christs Body* in the *Sacrament* as real, proper and substantial as *Catholics* do, but deny an exclusion of *Bread*. For *Bread*, say they, remains as before, but to and with it the Body of our Lord (every where present) is in a sort hypostatically united: Yet some among them deny any *reverence* is to be exhibited to Christ, though

Calvin in 1 Cor. cap. 11. 24.

Casaub. Ep. ad. Card. Per.

though indeed ſubſtantially preſent. 4. That of *Roman Catholics*, whoſe ſenſe was ſet down before; whereto this only is to be added, That believing a real converſion of Bread into our Lords Body, &c. they think themſelves obliged, in conformity to the Ancient Church, as to embrace the Doctrine, ſo to imitate their practiſe in exhibiting due reverence and worſhip (not to the *Symbols*, not to any thing which is the object of ſenſe, as *Calviniſts* ſlander them; but) to *our Lord* himſelf only, preſent in and under the *Symbols*.

7. Now three of theſe four Opinions, that is, every one but that of *Engliſh Proteſtants* ſpeak intelligible ſenſe: Every one knows what *Zuinglians*, *Lutherans*, and *Roman Catholics* mean: But theirs (which they call a Myſtery) is indeed a *Jargon*, a *Linſey-wolſey Stuff*, made probably to ſuit with any *Sect* according to intereſts: They that taught it firſt in *England*, were willing to ſpeak at leaſt, and, if they had been permitted, to mean likewiſe as the *Catholic Church* inſtructed them, but the *Sacrilegious Protectour* in *King Edwards daies*, and afterward the *Privy Council* in *Queen Elizabeths*, found it for their worldly advantage, that their *Divines* ſhould, at leaſt in words, accuſe the *Roman Church* for that *Doctrine* which themſelves believed to be true. But now, ſince the laſt Reſtitution, if that renew'd *Rubrick* at the end of the *Communion*, be to be eſteem'd *Doctrinal*,

Virtuall, then the *laſt Edition* of their *Religion* in this Point is meer *Zuinglianiſm*, to which the *Preſbyterians* themſelves, if they are true *Calviniſts*, will refuſe to ſubſcribe. Thus the *new Religion of England* is almoſt become the *Religion of New England*.

8. It remains now that I ſhould by a few authorities juſtifie our *Catholic Doctrine* of *Tranſubſtantiation*, or *real ſubſtantial Preſence*, to be far from deſerving to be called a *Novelty* of four hundred years ſtanding. By *Catholic Doctrine*, I mean the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, not of the *Schools*, the *Doctrine* delivered by *Tradition*, not *Ratiocination*: Not a *Doctrine* that can be demonſtrated by human empty *Philoſophy*. On the contrary, it may be confidently aſſerted, that all ſuch pretended demonſtrations are not only not concluding, but illuſory, becauſe that is ſaid to be demonſtrated by reaſon, which *Tradition* tells us is above reaſon, and ought not to be ſquared by the Rule of *Philoſophy*: The *preſence* of *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament* is truly real and *Subſtantial*, but withall *Sacramental*, that is *Myſtical*, inexplicable, incomprehenſible. It is a great miſtake among Proteſtants, when they argue that we, by acknowledging a *Converſion* by *Tranſubſtantiation*, pretend to declare the *modum converſionis*. No; that is far from the *Churches*, or the *Antient Fathers* thoughts. For by that expreſſion ſhe only ſignifies, the *change* is not a matter of *farcy*, but

but *real*, yet withal *Mystical*. The *Fathers*, to expresse their belief of a *real conversion*, make use of many real changes mentioned in the Scripture, as of *Aarons Rod into a Serpent, of water into wine, &c.* But withal they adde, That not any of these Examples do fit, or properly represent the *Mystical change* in the *Sacrament*: Sence or Reason might comprehend and judge of those changes, but *Faith* alone must submit to the incomprehensibleness of this. When Water was turn'd into Wine, the eyes saw, and the Palat tasted Wine, it had the colour, extension, and locality of Wine; But so is it not when *Bread* by *consecration* becomes the *Body* of *Christ*; For ought that Sence can judge, there is no change at all: *Christs Body* is present, but without *locality*: It is present, but not corporally, as natural bodies are present, one part here, and another there. The *Quomodo* of this presence is not to be inquired into, nor can it without presumption be determin'd. This is that which the *Church* calls a *Sacramental, Mystical presence.* But, that this presence is real and substantial, a presence in the *Symbols* or *Elements*, and not only in the mind of the worthy receiver, the *Fathers* unanimously teach: And indeed if it were not so, none could receive the *Body* of *Christ unworthily*, because according to Protestants, it is not the *Body* of *Christ*, but meer Bread that an impenitent Sinner receives: And St.

Pauls

Pauls charge would be irrational, when he saies, such *An one receives judgment to himself in that he does not discern the Body of our Lord.* 1 Cor. 11. 29. Besides, if the change be not in the *Elements*, but in the *Receivers Soul*, what need is there of *Consecration?* What effect can *Consecration* have? Why may not another man or woman as well as a *Priest*, administer this *Sacrament?* What hinders that such a *Presence* may not be effected in the mind every Dinner or Supper, and as well when we eat flesh, and drink any other Liquor besides Wine at our own Table, as at that of our Lord.

9. Now, whether their Doctrine or ours be a *Novelty*, let *Antiquity* judge. If I should produce, as he knows I may, hundreds of Testimonies that by conversion a change is made of the *Bread* into the *Body*, and *Wine* into the *Blood* of *Christ*, he would think to escape by allowing a change to be made, but only in the *Act* of worthy receiving. Therefore I will onely make use of such *Authorities* as demonstrate this change to be made before communicating; that it remains, when the *Sacrament* is reserved, and that immediately after *consecration*, before any participation of the *Symbols*, both the *Priest* and People did perform an act of *Adoration* to *Christ*, believed to be really and *substantially*, though *mystically*, present.

10. In all ancient *Liturgies* (as *Blondel* himself, though a *Huguenot*, confesses) the prayer Blondel.

er in the consecration of the Elements was,
Liturg. S. Basil. Cyril. Hier. Catech. Myst. 5. *That God would by the holy Spirit sanctifie the Elements, whereby the Bread may be made the Body, and the Wine the Blood of our Lord.* And, that before communicating, whilst it was on the *Altar*, it was esteem'd and worshiped as the true *Body* of our Lord, St. *Chrysostome* will
Chrys. in 1 Cor. 10. hom. 24. witnesse, *Let us*, saith he, *who are Citizens of Heaven, imitate but even the barbarous Magi*, (who worshipped our *Lord* an *Infant*, &c.) *Thou seest him not in the Manger, but on the Altar. Thou dost not see a woman holding him, but the Priest standing by him, and the Spirit with great vertue hovering over these* (Mysteries) *proposed. Thou not only seest the Body it self, as the Magi did, but thou knowest also the vertue of it*, &c. *The same Body which is the most precious and most honour'd thing in Heaven, I will shew thee placed upon Earth*, &c. *Neither dost thou only see it, but touchest and eatest it, and having received it,*
Optat. lib. 6. *thou returnest home with it*, &c. Hence *Optatus* saith, *What other thing is the Altar, but the Seat of the Body and Blood of Christ.* A yet more irrefragable witnesse hereof is the General Council of *Nice*, wherein (*Act. l.* 3. c. *de Divinâ mensâ*) are these words, *In this Divine Table let us not abase our intentions so as to consider the Bread and Wine set before us, but raising up our mind by Faith, let us understand that upon that holy Table is placed the Lamb of God, which takes away the sins of the World, which is unbloodily immolated by the Priest, and receiving his pre-*

cious

cious Body and Blood, let us truly believe that these are the Symbols of our Redemption.

And, that the *Elements*, once consecrated and after reserved, yet remain the *Body* of *Christ* though not participated, St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* expressly testifies, *I hear* (saith he) *there are others who affirm that the Mystical Eulogy, if any thing of it remain till another day, doth profit nothing to sanctification. But they are mad who say these things: For Christ is not alter'd, neither is his holy Body changed; but the vertue of Benediction and quickning grace perpetually remains in it.* And as touching *Adoration* of our *Lord*, as acknowledged substantially present on the *Altar*, St. *Ambrose* expressly asserts it, *Adore the foot-stool of his feet. Therefore by the foot-stool is understood the Earth; and the Earth the flesh of Christ, which at this day also we adore in the Mysteries, and which the Apostles adored in our Lord Jesus.* And from St. *Ambrose* the same is taught as expressly by St. *Augustin*, discoursing on the same Text, *Adorate Scabellum pedum ejus*: Who moreover adds, *Christ hath given his flesh to be eaten by us for our Salvation: Now no man eats this, except he first adore it.* Yea, moreover he saies, *We do not only not sin by adoring it, but we should sin if we did not adore it.* And in an Epistle to *Honoratus*, he affirms, *That the rich of the Earth and proud are sometimes brought to the Table of our Lord, and there receive of his Body and Blood, but they onely adore it, they are not satiated with it, because they*

Cyril. Al. Ep. ad Calosyr.

Ambr. de Spis. lib. 3. cap. 12.

Aug. in Psal. 98. 5.

Id. Epist. 120.

do not imitate him (by humility.) For of the humble it is said, *Edent pauperes & saturabuntur.*

11. The same may be inferr'd by the wonderfull niceness and *scrupolosity* observed in the *Primitive Church* in the handling, communicating and reserving these *Mysteries*; what a crime was it esteem'd in the *Primitive times*, if but a crum or drop of the consecrated *Elements* should fall to the ground? For fear of that, till about the year six hundred they were received by the *Communicants* not in their *Fingers*, as among the *Reformed*, but in the inside plain of their hands, and in a *silver Pipe*, &c. But I will conclude this point with a brief Answer to the *Doctors Allegations.*

12. Whereas therefore he says, *It is evident that Transubstantiation was never taught by our Saviour, since in the same breath wherewith he pronounced these words*, This is my Blood, *he explain'd himself by calling it expresly the Fruit of the Vine.* On the contrary I do confidently pronounce it to be evident, that those words were neither spoken by *our Lord* in the same breath after the *Consecration* of the *Chalice*, nor had they any regard to the *Sacrament.* 'Tis true they are mentioned by St. *Matthew* after the *Consecration*, but he knows that in St. *Luke*, who promised to write καθεξῆς, those words are mentioned before any Consecration began, and the occasion of them is evi-

evidently the eating of the *Paſchal Supper* &c. For this is his *Narration*: *When the hour was come he ſate down, and the twelve Apoſtles with him. And he ſaid unto them, with deſire I have deſired to eat this Paſſeover with you before I ſuffer. For I ſay unto you, I will not any more eat thereof until it be fulfill'd in the kingdom of God. And he took the Cup and gave thanks, and ſaid, Take this and divide it among your ſelves, For I ſay unto you I will not drink of the fruit of the Vine, until the kingdom of God ſhall come.* Now after all this follows his own *laſt Supper*, the *Myſtical conſecration* and *communion* of his *bleſſed Body* and *Blood*. For the Text thus continues, *And he took Bread ſaying, This is my Body, &c. likewiſe alſo the Cup after Supper, ſaying, This Cup, &c.* This being the order of the words, no Text can poſſibly with more evidence confute the Doctor than this which himſelf cites: for what can be clearer, if before Conſecration our *Saviour* ſaid, *He would drink no more of the fruit of the Vine?* then that what he drank after was not of the fruit of the Vine? But beſides this, though our Lord ſhould have called it, after *Conſecration*, *the fruit of the Vine*, as Saint *Paul* calls the other *Symbol Bread*: this does not argue againſt a Change in their nature; For *Moſes* his Rod, after it was changed into a *Serpent* is call'd a *Rod* ſtill, becauſe it had been one [*Exod.* 7. 12.] and [*Jo.* 2. 9.] it is ſaid, *That the Maſter*

Luke 22. 14, 18.

Ibid. 19, 20.

ster of the Feast tasted the Water that was made Wine.

13. Is not now the Doctor's Insincerity evident his Insincerity even in the Pulpit? has he not palpably mis-inform'd *his Majesty* and so illustrious an Auditory? And though he should still continue to prefer St. *Matthews* order of Narration before St. *Lukes*, yet what St. *Luke* writes cannot possibly be applyed to the *Sacrament*: For, though those special words, *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, until, &c.* if they stood alone, might seem applicable to the *consecrated Chalice*: yet those other of Saint *Luke*, *I will not any more eat of this Passeover, untill, &c.* cannot possibly be applyed to the *consecrated Elements* of *Bread*: and therefore since both these Sayings were manifestly intended of the same Subject; It is more than evident they were meant only of the *Paschal Supper*, and not at all of the *Sacrament*.

Matth. 26. 29.

Serm. pag. 14.

14. As for *Bellarmins quarrel with St. Thomas his affirming that one Body cannot be locally in two places; and his revengeful inference, that neither then can they be Sacramentally*: All I will say hereto shall be, that if there be any quarrel on *Bellarmins* part, which truly I do not find to be such but may very friendly be composed. Yet however since it is only about a *Scholastical Notion* of *Locality, Circumscription, &c.* and it is apparent, that

that both theſe *Doctors* held a true *Subſtantial preſence of our Lords Body* in the *Sacrament*, as the *Church teaches*, I will not, by troubling my ſelf about compoſing the matter between them, invite the Doctor hereafter to unneceſſary excurſions: It is only the Churches Doctrin that I engage my ſelf to juſtifie.

15. In the laſt place, touching *Berinarius* his ſubmiſſion, if the *Form* were the ſame mentioned in the *Doctors Margin* from *Floriacenſis*, there is nothing appears in it favouring *Conſubſtantiation*. Certainly, it was ſufficient, if he ſpoke ſincerely, to acquit him from any ſuſpition of holding onely *a Figurative Preſence of Chriſt's Body*: and that onely was his buſineſſe. As for his Expreſſions that *Our Lords Body, not onely in Myſtery, but Truth is handled, broken and chawed with the teeth of Faithful Communicants*, unleſſe they be underſtood Sacramentally, they are far from being juſtifiable. And ſo are all the *Capharnaitical Objections* that Proteſtants make againſt Catholic Doctrine in this matter. VVe acknowledge *more than a Spiritual*, an *Oral Manducation*, but without any Suffering or Change in the *Divine Body* it ſelf: VVe acknowledge it is Nouriſhment to us, but not after a Carnal manner; Chriſt is not changed Serm. pag. 25.

by Digestion into our Bodyes; yet sanctifies even our Bodies also, as well as our Souls: Because in Saint *Gregory Nyssen* his Expression, *Insinuating it self into our Bodies, by an union with our Lord's Immortal Body, We are made Partakers of Immortality.*

Greg. Nyss. orat. Catech. c. 37.

CHAP.

CHAP. XII.

Of Communion under one Species. Confirm'd by the practiſe of the Primitive Church in private Communions. The Preachers Objections ſolved.

1. HIS *fifth pretended Novelty*, imputed to the *Catholic Church* is, *Communion under one Species, no older*, ſaies he, *then ſince the time of Aquinas, unleſſe they will own it from the Manichees. But we find our Saviour intended the Chalice to every gueſt: Drink all of this*, ſaies he. *And St.* Paul *ſpeaks as well of drinking the Myſtical Blood, as eating the Body of Chriſt.* Serm. pag. 9. Ibid. pag. 25.

2. To the ſubſtance of what is here alleged, we readily ſubſcribe. We acknowledg our *Saviour* inſtituted this Myſtery in both kinds; That the *Apoſtles* received it in both kinds: That St. *Paul* ſpeaks as well of *drinking*, &c. That moſt commonly in the Church till a little before the times of *Aquinas*, in the *public*

public Celebration of these *Mysteries*, the people communicated in both kinds: All this we agree to.

3. But the general *Tradition* of the Church, at least from his *beginning*, will not permit us to yield, that the receiving in both kinds was esteem'd by the Church *necessary* to the *essence* of the *Communion*, or integrity of the participation of Christs Body and Blood, or that it is fitly called by him *a half Communion*, when deliver'd and receiv'd only in one kind. On the contrary, we appeal to Dr. *Pierces* own Conscience, whether, if we should yield this, we should not be overwhelm'd with the *Depositions* of the most ancient *Fathers* against us: As evidently appears in *Communions* anciently practised *under one kind* only, and this upon many occasions: As during the times of persecution in *Domestic Communions* mention'd by *Tertullian*, St. *Cyprian*, and others, in which the *holy Eucharist* was deliver'd to the Faithful under the species of *Bread* alone, and by them carried home, to be reverently participated by them, according to their particular Devotions: The same was practised in *communicating Infants*, or innocent *Children of more years*, (witnesse besides the said *Fathers*, the practise of the Church of *Constantinople* mentioned by *Nicephorus*:) In *communicating the Sick*, and *Penitents at the point of death*: In *communions at Sea*: In *communions sent to other Provinces*, &c.

Tertull. lib. 2. ad Uxo. Cypr. l. de lapsis. Ambr. orat. 1. in obitu frat. Aug. lib. 2. lit. Petil. c. 23. Eusеb. lib. 5. & lib. 7. Beda in Mart. ad 15. August. Niseph. hist. lib. 18. cap. 6.

4. In

4. In all these Cases the *Communicants* were esteem'd to be partakers of *entire Christ*, nor did they think they received more of him at publick Communions in the *Church*, when the *Sacrament* was delivered in both species, then when at home in one only. They believed it was *Christ* entire which they received in every divided particle of the *species* of *Bread*, and every divided drop of the *species* of *Wine*: and that the *flesh of Christ* could not be participated without a concomitance of his *Blood*, nor the *Blood* without the *Flesh*, nor either of them without a concomitance of his *Soul* and *Divinity*. Hence St. *Ambrose*, *Christ is in that Sacrament, because it is the Body of Christ*. And the *Council of Ephesus*, *That those who approach to the Mystical Benedictions do participate the Flesh of Christ, not as common meer Flesh, but truly quickning Flesh*. And St. *Augustin*, *That Christ*, [ferebatur in manibus suis] *did carry himself in his own hands*: and this in a litteral sense. And St. *Cyril* of *Alexandria* says, *By the unparted Garment of Christ was mystically signified, that the four parts of the world, being brought to salvation by the Gospel, did divide among themselves his Flesh without dividing it. For* (says he) *the only begotten Son of God passing into, and, by his Flesh, sanctifying the Soul and Body of each of them severally and in particular, is in each of them entirely and undividedly, being every where one, and in no sort divided.*

Ambr. de iis qui Myster. c. 9.

Concyl. Eph. in Ep st. ad Nestor.

August. in Psal. 33.

Cyril. Alex. lib. 12. in Ioan. cap. 32.

5. These

5. These things thus premised (which are certain Truths, and cannot by the Preacher be deny'd) since he will needs make a quarrel with the Catholic Church upon this *Subject*, he must necessarily take upon him to demonstrate, 1. Either, that these *Communions under one species*, allowed and practised on so many occasions in the Primitive times, were *half Communions*, sacrilegious Transgressions of the Institution of *our Lord*, contrary to the teaching of St. *Paul*, conspiring with the *Heresie of the Manichees*, &c. And doing so, he will contradict himself, whilst he pretends *half Communions* to be a *Novelty* since their times. 2. Or, if these Practises were justifiable, and that the Church had warrant and authority to do as she did, he must prove that such an *Authority* could be extended only to *private Persons* or *Families*, and by no means to *publick Congregations*: That the same was *a whole Communion* in a *Chamber*, and but a *half Communion in a Church*: That a *sick man*, or one *at Sea*, &c. broke not the institution of *Christ* whilst he communicated under one kind, but did break it when he was in health or upon firm ground.

6. Till these things be proved by him (which will be *ad Græcas Calendas* he must of necessity grant, that here is no *Novelty* at all, no change in the present *Catholic Church* as to *Doctrin*: And that the change which is made in external *Discipline*, is of so great importance, that

Protestants

Protestants (who would not have separated from her *Communion*; if she had given them leave to break our *Saviours Institution* only privatly) will renounce her, because she thinks and knows that a privat *House* and a *Church* cannot make the same action both lawful and unlawful, and therfore since she had authority within doors, she cannot be deprived of it abroad.

7. Nay further, *Doctor Pierce's* task does not end here: for though he should be able to prove all this, yet if this be one of the provocations, and causes of their *separation*, he cannot justifie that *separation* till they have made a tryal, whether the *Church* will not dispence with them as to this point of *Discipline*, and after tryal, been refused. For surely he will not esteem *Schism* a matter so inconsiderable, as to expose themselves to the guilt of it, because others besides them are obliged and content to receive under *one species*, whilst themselves are left at liberty: They will not unnecessarily make tumults and divisions in the *Church* by disputing against others, when they themselves are not concern'd. Now, that such a *dispensation* may possibly be had, does appear, in that the *Church* by a *General Council* hath either given to, or acknowledged in her *Supreme Pastor* a sufficient authority *to proceed in this matter according to his own prudence, and as he shall see it to be profitable to the Church, and for the spiritual good of those that shall demand the use of the Chalice.* Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. in fin.

8. As

8. As for us *Catholics*, we are bred up to the *Orders* eſtabliſhed by *Gods Church*: And being aſſured that our Lord will not forget his *Promiſes*, and conſequently his Church ſhall never miſlead us to our danger, we do not think it our duty to queſtion the *Churches* prudence, or ſet up a *private Tribunal* to cenſure her Lawes: We are not ſure we know all the Reaſons that induced the *Council of Conſtance* to confirm a practiſe almoſt generally introduced by cuſtome before. Yet ſome Reaſons we ſee, which truly are of very great moment for that purpoſe, to wit, the wonderful encreaſe of the *numbers* of *Communicants*, and wonderful decay of their *Devotion*: From whence could not be prevented very great dangers of Irreverences and *effuſion* oft-times of the *precious blood* of our Lord, conſidering the defect of providence, and caution to be expected in multitudes, little ſenſible of Religion.

It is probable likewiſe that the *Hereſie of Berengarius*, who acknowledged no more in the *Sacrament*, than the meer *ſigns* of the *body* and *blood* of our *Lord*, might induce the *Catholics* publickly to practiſe what the *Primitive Church* did privatly, to the end they might thereby demonſtrate, that though they received not both the *Signs*, yet they were not defrauded of being partakers of all that was entirely contained under *both* the *Species*, which was *whole Chriſt*, not his *body* only, but alſo his *blood*, &c.

Chap.

CHAP. XIII.

Of the Sacrifice of the Maſſe. *Aſſerted Univerſally by Antiquity. The true Doctrine concerning it explained.*

1. HIS *ſixth ſuppoſed Novelty* (which is the *third* that regards the *bleſſed Sacrament*) is *the Sacrafice of the Maſſe*. But how is this prov'd to be a Novelty? *Ipſe dixit*. Not one *Text*, not one *Quotation* appears in the Margin; and why? Alas! where ſhould he find any? Since there's not a *Father* in *Gods Church* from the very Apoſtles, but acknowledged a Chriſtian Sacrifice; nor any old *Heretick* ever denyed it. Nay, who beſides himſelf calls it *a Novelty*? I am ſure Dr. *Fulk* expreſly confeſſeth that *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Auſtin*, *Hierom*, *and a great many more do witneſſe that Sacrifice, yea, Sacrifice for the Dead is the Tradition of the Apoſtles*. And Mr. *Aſcham* acknowledges that the *Sacrifice of the Maſſe* Serm. Pag. 13. Fulk. confut. of Purg. page 362, &c.

Aſcham. Apol. pro cœna Dom. *Maſſe is ſo antient, that no firſt beginning of it can be ſhewed.* Yet Dr. *Pierce* would fain have proved it to be a *Novelty* Gladly would he have applyed to this, his *From the beginning it was not ſo*: But could not find one Word in *Antiquitie* for his purpoſe. However, for all that it muſt not be omitted. His Auditors would have wonderd to hear the Church accuſed, and the clauſe touching the *Sacrifice* left out of the Indictment.

2. To pleaſe therefore popular ears, he named it, as an ill thing: But coming to print his *Sermon*, he leaves that *Margin* empty: For what could be in the *Fathers* to fill it? It was not for his purpoſe to quote St. *Ignatius's* ſaying, *It is not lawful either to offer, or to immolate the Sacrifice or Θυσιαστήριον without the Biſhop*: (*Which*, (ſay the Centuriſts) *are dangerous words, and ſeeds of Errors*) Or St. *Irenæus*, who tells us that our Lord, conſecrating the Myſtical Elements, *Taught us a New Oblation of the New Teſtament, which the Church having received from the Apoſtles, offers to God through the whole World.* Or St. *Cyprian*, whoſe words are, *Who was more a Prieſt of the moſt High God, then our Lord Jeſus Chriſt? Who offred a Sacrifice to God the Father? and offred the very ſame that Melchiſedech had offred, that is, Bread and Wine, to wit, his own Body and Blood, &c. and commanded the ſame to be afterward done in memory of him. That Prieſt therefore doth truly ſupply the place and function of Chriſt,*

Ignat. Ep. ad. Smirn. cent. 2. cap. 4.

Iren. l. 4. c. 32.

Cypr. Epiſt. ad Cyrill.

Christ, and imitates that which Christ did, who undertakes to offer according as he sees Christ himself offerd. In which one *Epistle* he calls the *Eucharist* a *Sacrifice*, *seven* times, and above *twenty* times he affirms that the *Symbols* are offred in it.

3. The truth is, in the writings of *Antiquity*, the *celebration* of these *Mysteries*, is scarce ever call'd by other name, but *Oblation, Sacrifice, Immolation*, &c. And because the *Fathers* may be said to speak figuratively and rhetorically, the *Canons* also of the *Church*, which ought to speak properly, scarce ever use any other expression. See the *third* among the *Apostolic Canons*; The 58*th*. *Canon* of the *Council of Laodicea*: The 20*th*. *Canon* of the *first Council of Arles*: The 40*th*. *Canon* of the *Council of Carthage*: And the 18*th*. *Canon* of the *first General Council of Nice*, in which are these words, *The Holy Synod is inform'd, that in some places Deacons administer the Eucharist to Priests: A thing which neither any Canon nor Custom hath deliver'd, that those who have no power of offering should give the Body of Christ to those who offer.* Whole volums may be transcribed to this effect: I will only therefore refer him to St. *Hierom* on *Titus*, and St. *Chrysostom* on the *Acts*, where he will find the *Eucharist* not only a *Sacrifice*, but *a Sacrifice for remission of sins*, ; *a Sacrifice for the Priest that offers*; *a Sacrifice for the multitude*; *a Sacrifice for the procuring of plenty*, &c. *Hier. on Tit. cap. 1. Chrys. 21. hom.* suitably

to the modern and ancient *Liturgies*.

4. If after all this he will not allow any of these expressions in *Doctors*, *Canons*, *Liturgies*, &c. to be *proper* and litteral, St. *Augustin* will contradict him: Who saies, *Presbyters and Bishops are now in the Church properly called* [*Sacerdotes*] *sacrificing Priests*. And because the fancy which Protestants have entertained against the term *Sacrifice*, *Oblation*, &c. proceeds from a mistake of the true sense in which the *Church* intends it; for ordinarily the conception of a *Sacrifice* is supposed to import an *immolation*, shedding of blood, killing, &c. and no such matter appearing here, but only a commemoration of a former real immolation and *shedding of Christs blood*, therefore generally among all *Sects*, divided from the *Church*, the title of *Sacrifice* will not be endured.

Aug. lib. 20. de Civ. D. cap. 10.

5. To prevent therefore for the future such a mis-understanding, let them be pleased to take notice that all the *Sacrifices* of the *Law* were shadows and *types* of the *Sacrifice* of *our Lord*, and the *Legal Priest-hood a type* of *his Priest-hood*: But above all other *Sacrifices* and functions of *Priest-hood*, those were most lively figures of our *Lord*, which were perform'd on a certain day only once every year, for the sins of the whole Congregation: In the solemn celebration of which *Sacrifice*, besides the immolation of it on the *Altar*, the *High Priest* alone was appointed to carry

carry of the blood of that *Victime* into the *most holy place* within the *Veile*, and there to ſprinkle it before the *Propitiatory* or *Mercy-Seat*. This is that *Sacrifice* which St. *Paul* eſpecially applies to our *Lord*, and ſhews that Chriſt, as a *Victime*, was once, and but once immolated on the *Altar of the Croſs* for the ſins of all mankind: And that for the merit of his obedience to the death even of the *Croſs*, he was raiſed from death, and made a *Prieſt* after the order of *Melchiſedech*, a *Kingly Prieſt*, a *Prieſt* who had power given him in Heaven and Earth, to apply the merits of his own *Sacrifice*: And that the proper function of his *Regal Prieſthood*, was the entring with his immolated *Body* into the *Sancta Sanctorum*, the higheſt Heavens, there appearing before his heavenly *Fathers Throne*, and preſenting that moſt precious *Victime* to him. This *function* of *Prieſt-hood*, far more auguſt than the immolation, he does, and will continually exerciſe to the end of the World. By vertue of this he is made *Head of the Church*, he has the power of ſending the *Holy Ghoſt*, &c. and hereby he perfects *Redemption*.

6. And withal, knowing of what infinite value and vertue this function of his *Prieſthood is*, he has been pleaſed to execute, as it were by proxy, the ſame function on Earth, that himſelf immediately performs in Heaven. For which purpoſe he has inſtituted

Bishops and *Priests* to be not only his *Ministers*, but *Substitutes* and *Vice-gerents* on Earth, giving them power to consecrate, and by consecrating to place upon the *Altar* that very *Body* and *Blood* which was immolated on the *Cross*, and is now present before his Father in Heaven. This *body* and *blood* they *Sacrifice*, this they *offer*, this they with the people *participate*. It is not a Sacrifice of immolation, in that mistaken sense, for nothing is slain, the Victime suffers nothing: It is but a *Commemorative Sacrifice of Immolation*: But it is, in the most proper rigorous sence, *an Oblation*, the very same, of the very same *body* and *blood* that *our Lord* now offers in Heaven: And the same vertue it has, the same effects it produces, *propitiation, remission of sins, participation of the graces of Gods holy Spirit, and all blessings both spiritual and temporal.* So that in a word, as under the *Law* the *Legal propitiation* was said to perfected by the *High Priests offring the blood in the most holy place*: So by this *Oblation* of *Christs blood* in the *Heavenly Sanctuary*, *perfect Redemption* is obtained, and by the *Commemorative Oblation of the same body and blood by his Priests* in our earthly Sanctuaries, an application of the benefit and vertue of that *only meritorious Sacrifice* once offred on the *Cross*, is then procured unto us for remission of our sins, and the donation of all other benefits, spiritual and temporal.

7. In

7. In regard of this sublime function of the *Priest* it is, that the *holy Fathers* exalt his office before that of *Princes*, yea even of *Angels*: in this regard they call the *oblation* it self the most dreadful *Mystery*, at which the *Angels* themselves assist with reverence and astonishment. To which purpose I will content my self with only one or two passages of St. *Chrysostom*: *When the Sacrifice*, saith he, *is brought out of the Quire, Christ himself the Lamb of our Lord immolated; When thou shalt hear the Deacons voyce crying, Let us pray all in common, when thou seest the Curtains and Veyls of the Gates drawn, then think the Heavens are opened and the Angels descend.* And in an other place: *When the Priest has invocated the Holy Spirit and perfected the Sacrifice full of terrour and reverence, touching and handling with his Fingers him who is Lord of all things, to how sublime a rank is he elevated, &c. In that time the Angels assist the Priest, and all the Celestial powers send forth cryes of joy, all the places about the Altar are filled with Quires of Angels in honour of him who is offered. This we may have ground to believe, if we only consider the super-eminent greatness of the Sacrifice then performed. But moreover I have heard from the report of one who learnt the story from the mouth of an admirable old man, to whom many revelations of divine Mysteries have been revealed from Heaven: How God was graciously pleased to honor him with a Vision of these things,* Chrysost. in Eph. cap. 1. hom. 3. Id. l. 6. de Sacerdot.

and how in the time of the Sacrifice he saw suddenly appear, with as much splendor as human sight could support, a multitude of Angels cloathed with white Robes encompassing the Altar, and having their heads inclined in the same posture, as we oft see the Souldiers in the presence of the Emperour. Thus Saint Chrysostom.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIV.

Of Veneration of Images. The Roman-Churches *approved practiſe of it moſt ſuitable to Reaſon.*

1. THe *ſeventh Novelty* produced by the *Preacher* is *the worſhipping of Images:* but it being only named, without any proofs or quotations, I will ſpare them too: And to ſhew that the term of *worſhipping* is none of ours, but invented by *Proteſtants* to render a moſt innocent Doctrin odious, and moreover to demonſtrate the no grounds ſuch *Preachers* as he have to accuſe the *Catholic Church* of, I know not what, *Idolatry* in this matter of *Images*, I will preſume to borrow from an *Author* (who will not be angry with me for it) a paſſage touching this *Point*, by which he will ſee, that *Catholics* do no more than every mans own reaſon wil juſtify, in the reſpect they give to *ſacred Images*. It is the nameleſſe *Author of an Anſwer to Mr. Bagſhaw's Treatiſe of Infallibility*: where he will find this following paſſage, in which there are ſome glances, that Anſwer to Mr. Bagſh. p. 70, &c.

regard only such furious impertinents as *Mr. Bagshaw*, which therefore I am far from thinking applyable to *Doctor Pierce*.

2. Thus then writes that *Author*, intending to demonstrate that in the *veneration of Images* taught by the *Catholic Church* there is nothing at all swerving from common reason: "Give me leave, saith he, to propose to such a "sober man as you are, altogether compounded of Reason, some few Questions. First "then suppose there were represented to you "while you were thinking of other matters, "or talking, a *Picture* of *our Lord* hanging on "the *Cross*: could you possibly avoid the calling to mind who *our Lord* was, and what "he had done or suffered for you? And if "not being able to forbid the entrance of such "thoughts into your mind on such an occasion would your reason dictate to you that "you had done ill in changing your thoughts "from the World to *God*, would you repent "of it, asking pardon of *God*, and praying "that such a tentation might never befall you "afterwards? Does your enlightned reason suggest this to you? Truly if it do, I "believe you are of a temper of mind, almost "specifically different from all mankind besides, and they must change their nature before you make them of your perswasion, or "*Church*. And yours is no a *common sense*, "if it either tell you, that by your beating "down of *Crosses* and breaking *Church* windows,

" *downs*, our good *Countrymen* think more of " *God* than they did while thoſe Remembran- " ces were ſtanding: or if they think leſs, that " it is better for them to forget him.

3. " To make a ſtep further, Let it be ſup- " poſed that at the ſame time you ſaw before " you ſeveral Pictures of ſeveral Perſons in a " contrary manner regarded by you, as of St. " *Peter* and *Judas*, of our *late Sovereign* and " *Bradſhaw*: Or put caſe you had in one " hand a *Bible*, and in the other the infamous " ſtory of *Pantagruel*: does not your com- " mon ſenſe and reaſon tell you, that ſuch Pi- " ctures or Books force upon you quite con- " trary thoughts and affections, which re- " gard thoſe Pictures or Books not ſimply " conſidered, but as repreſenting ſuch Per- " ſons, and containing ſuch matters? Which " thoughts being juſt, and not at all harm- " full to you, and withall almoſt impoſſible to " be avoided, I cannot find any reaſon why " Reaſon ſhould forbid them: I am ſure *com-* " *mon ſenſe* will not.

4. " If then it be according to reaſon, and " common ſenſe, and likewiſe unavoidably to " admit ſuch different thoughts: will not rea- " ſon alſo warrant you to expreſs outwardly " by words or actions, whatever you may " without any fault think inwardly? For my " part I cannot imagin any ſcruple in this. If " then I may and muſt think reverently or " contemptuouſly of the *Objects*, I may as well

" ſpeak,

"ſpeak, or behave my ſelf externally after "the ſame manner to them reſpectively; for "whatſoever is ill or good in words or acti-"ons, is ſo likewiſe in thoughts.

5. "Now to ſhew that ſuch thoughts or "affections regard not the Perſons only but "the Pictures alſo as repreſentations of ſuch "Perſons, ask your own heart and you will "find that you would not place *St. Peter's* "picture, or the *King's* in an unclean, diſho-"neſt place. If any one ſhould ſpit upon ei-"ther of them, your heart would riſe againſt "him, and tempt you to ſtrike him: which "it would not do, if the ſame contemptuous "uſage were ſhewed to the picture of *Judas* "or *Bradſhaw*. Now this is ſo naturally im-"bibed in the hearts of all Mankind, that in all "*Kings Courts* a reſpect and outward mark of "reverence is required to the *Chamber of Pre-"ſence*, or *Chair of State*: and a refuſal of it, "much more a contemptuous behaviour, "would be criminal. To apply this to the "forementioned *Books*: You could not bring "your reaſon to permit you to tear out a leaf "of the *Bible* for an unclean uſe, as you could "without the leaſt remorſe do to the *Story of "Pantagruel* or *Æſop's fables*.

6. "Let us now conſider what kind of re-"ſpect this is that we expreſſe to ſuch *Images*. "Comparing the Images of St. *Peter* and our "*Soveraign's* together, we find that a reſpectful "regard is had to both, and a contemptuous

"uſage

" uſage of either would diſpleaſe us: Yet it is " not the ſame kind of reſpect: For St. *Peter's* " Image we conſider as of a man that puts us " in mind of Heaven ann Heavenly things, one " highly favour'd by *Almighty God*, a princi- " pal *Courtier* in his *Kingdom*, and one that " by his writings and example has been a great " inſtrument of promoting our eternal happi- " neſſe. We do not ſo eſteem of every *good* " *King*. Therefore to ſhew the difference of " our reſpect to each, we would chooſe to give " St. *Peter's* picture a place in our *Oratory*, and " the *Kings* in our *Gallery*. But what Names " to give theſe different reſpects is not eaſie to " determin. It is plain, that which is given " to the *King's* picture is purely a civil reſpect. " But what ſhall we call that which is given to " St. *Peters?* If we ſay it is *Religious*, you " will quarrel, as derogating from *God*. Let " us therefore call it a *ſacred Veneration*, or " *honor*: For ſince all things, that are ap- " pointed on purpoſe to mind us of God, of " Heaven, and the ſalvation of our Souls, we " call *Sacred*, this Name may well be apply- " ed to ſuch a Picture. But moreover, becauſe " there are not invented ſuch variety of " Names as there are things, and there are far " fewer ſorts of outward *poſtures* of our *Bo-* " *dys* denoting reſpect, than there are *Names* " or *Words*: Hence it comes to paſſe that " when we would expreſſe a *Civil* and a *Sa-* " *cred*, yea a *Religious* reſpect, we are forced

" to

"to use the same outward behaviour of *bow-*
"*ing*, *kneeling*, &c. to *Fathers* and *Magi-*
"*strates*, which we do to *God* himself: Yea
1 Chron. 29. "we find in the *Scripture* Kings *adored*, and a
20. "prostration of Bodies paid to them. Yet
"for all this no man will suspect that thereby
"any dishonor was intended to *God*, or the
"*Honor* due onely to him was paid to Crea-
"tures.

7. "In the next place let reason and com-
"mon sense give judgement of the distinction
"between the respect that may be paid to the
"Picture of St. *Peter*, and that which ought
"to be paid to Himself, in case he appear'd
"to us glorified as he is. *A Divine respect*
"we pay to neither, though sometimes we use
"such postures as we do when we pray or
"worship *God*. It is then a *Sacred Veneratio-*
"*n* only: But yet there are some expressions
"of respect which we would use to the Person,
"that would be ridiculous to the Picture, as
"reverently to speak to him, to beg his Pray-
"ers to God for us, to ask a Question, &c.

8. "Our *last Enquiry* shall be into the dif-
"ference of regard (if any there be) to *our*
"*Saviour's Picture* and *St. Peter's*, the for-
"mer representing to us him that is both *God*
"and *Man*, the later meerly *Man*. Howe-
"ver we shall find that the regard to both
"the Pictures is of the same species and na-
"ture, that is, only *Sacred*: because a Picture
"we never look upon, but as an instrument

"to

'to put us in mind, or to call to our memo-
'ries an object: And therefore it being of our
'own framing, is not capable of any reſpect
'beyond that which is due to ſo material, in-
'ferior a thing, what ever the object repre-
'ſented by it be. True it is, that the internal af-
'fections and thoughts occaſionally raiſed in
'our minds will be infinitely different, for we
'ſhall think upon *Chriſt* with *Adoration*, *Love*,
'*Reſignation* and *Obedience* due to *God* only:
'Not ſo of St. *Peter*: But the Pictures them-
'ſelves will be treated by us as Sacred Pictures
'only, that deſerve a reſpect proportionable:
'And ſince it is evident they are capable of a
'ſinful diſ-reſpect, conſequently a due reſpect
'may be paid to them. I ſay (*may*) *not always*
'*ought to be*: For then it would never be fit to
'put on ones Hat, &c. in a Room where
'there hangs a *Crucifix*.

9. 'To ſum up briefly our meaning in this
'whole matter: We find our minds too apt
'to be diſtracted from meditating on Divine
'things: Therefore we help our ſelves by ſuch
'as will call to our memories, and fix our
'thoughts upon objects good for our Souls:
'Such are holy *Pictures* both in times of pray-
'er and out, we find this benefit by them.
'Being ſuch *ſacred* things, we muſt renounce
'our reaſon, if we deny a reſpect may be due
'to them: But by honoring with an outward
'regard a Picture, we intend only to give a te-
'ſtimony what reſpect we bear to the perſon

'or

'or holy thing represented: And though for 'want of variety of postures, we shew some 'part of the same outward Reverence to the 'Pictures of St. *Peter* and *our Lord*, yet that 'signifies, we only *venerate* St. *Peter*, as a glo-'rious *Saint*, yet a Creature, but that we *a-'dore Christ, as God.* And no man that sees or 'knows us, can think otherwise. So that un-'lesse it be a sin to shew outwardly what we 'are oblig'd to think inwardly, there is not 'the least fault committed.

10. 'And now (Mr. *Bagshaw*) give me leave 'to acquaint you with your mistakes. First, 'this respect called by the *Church*, *Honor* and '*Veneration*, which we affirm may be payd to '*Sacred Images*, you call *Worshipping of Images*, 'meerly to make us odious to your ignorant '*Proselites*; For *worship* is commonly taken to 'be that honor which is due only to *God*, and 'which we abhor to give to Images. But Se-'condly, You give it an other name more a-'bominable, calling it *Idolatry*, *such as God pu-'nished in the worst of Pagans.* Once at least in 'your life speak your Conscience: Do you 'think, or only suspect, that we *Roman Catho-'lics* worship *false* Gods, and *true Devils*? Do 'we consider our *Images*, as they did their *I-'dols*, to which by *Magical conjurations* they an-'nexed an evil Spirit to do wonders, and to 'extort *Divine worship* from the seduced peo-'ple? Take heed *Sir*, how you persist in so 'unjust a Blasphemy against *Gods Church*: A

'time

'time will come that you will be called to a 'ſtrict account for it: It concerns you there-'fore to make ſome reparation.

11. 'But after all this take notice that the 'Catholic Church, though it declare that ſuch a 'veneration may fitly be given to holy Ima-'ges, as common reaſon, and human nature 'cannot chuſe but allow: Yet it commands 'none to afford them even ſo much. You may 'be a *Roman Catholic* all your life, and never 'be obliged to perform any external reſpect 'to an *Image*. There is not in *Catholic Coun-'tries* a *Groom* or *Kitchin-Maid* ſo ignorant, 'but would rather burn an *Image*, then afford 'it any honor due to *God* only. And ſhall 'thoſe that think thus, and do only what hu-'man reaſon generally approves, and cannot 'hinder, be eſteem'd and publiſht by you *the 'only Chriſtians in the World, fit to be thruſt out 'of all Chriſtian Kingdoms, and executed as Trai-'tors*, though otherwiſe they be acknowledg-'moſt faithful, peaceable men, and obedient 'Subjects? Are you not afraid of, *In quo judi-'cio judicaveritis, judicabimini?*

12. 'You ſee *Sir*, how ſince you will not 'admit of Authorities to juſtifie the Belief and 'Practiſe of *Roman Catholics*, but only com-'mon ſenſe and reaſon, I have complyed with 'you: And now in one word tell you, that 'you muſt never hope to make any ſober man 'believe that *Roman Catholics* are *Idolaters*, or 'even faulty in the matter of Images, till you

'can

'can demonstrate, 1. That it is unlawful to 'make use of our seeing faculty to put us in 'mind of *God*. 2. That he dishonors the 'King that shall with reverence, bare headed, 'and in a kneeling posture receive a *Letter* or 'Mandate that comes from him. 3. That it 'is a contempt of God to go through a 'Church with ones head uncovered. 4. And 'that it is unlawful and irreligious to make 'a scruple of using a Leaf of the *Bible* in the 'house of Office.

13. 'For a Farewel, I will conclude this 'Point with a Story, the truth whereof seve-'ral *Gentlemen*, *Protestants* too, in this *Town* are 'able to justifie. In the Year 1651. a devout *I-'talian Friar*, being appointed to preach in the 'Great *Dome* at *Padua*, the *Arch-bishop* present, 'and having been informed that among his 'Auditors there were some *English Protestants*, 'who in discourse had earnestly objected (as 'you do) *Idolatry* to *Catholics*: He therefore 'that he might encounter such a scandal, made 'choice of the Doctrine concerning *Images* 'for the subject of a great part of his *Sermon*. 'And when he came to that Point, holding in 'his hand a *Crucifix*, he tould his hearers, That 'that *Image* did in one glance lively represent, 'even to the most ignorant beholder, *our Lord* 'Jesus, *God and Man*, and almost all the Cir-'cumstances of his most bitter and accursed 'death, so patiently and willingly suffered 'for us. Thereupon with great Passion and

'Rhetoric

'Rhetoric he magnified the love of our Lord 'hanging on the Cross, earnestly pressing his 'Hearers to return a proportionable *Love* and '*Duty* to him. And during this Discourse, 'he often, with great reverence and tender- 'ness of affection embraced and devoutly kis- 'sed the *Crucifix*. Having said much to this 'purpose, after a little pause he pursued his 'Discourse, telling them he could not believe 'or suspect that any one who had heard and 'seen what he had said and done, could rea- 'sonably imagin that he had any intention to '*dishonor* our *Lord*, by that which he had done 'to the *Crucifix* which represented him, much 'lesse that he adored it, as if he thought it a 'kind of *God*, that he put his trust in it, as 'expecting any good from it, as if (he knew 'not what) *Divinitie*, Vertue or *Sanctitie* was 'in that carved piece of wood. Notwith- 'standing, because he had heard that such a 'scandalous imputation was by some mis- 'perswaded persons laid on the *Church*, he 'would then and there undeceive them. 'Thereupon he spit upon the *Crucifix*, threw 'it scornfully to the ground, and trampled 'it under his feet.

14. 'You see, Mr. *Bagshaw*, what kind of 'Idolaters the *Papists* are. Against this *Ido-* 'latry, let us see what expresse *Scripture* you 'can produce. This is the great *crime* for 'which there can be no expiation but *oppres-* 'sions, *Imprisonments*, and *Gallowses*. Now if

'what hath been here said give you no satis-
'faction, in case you have a mind to reply,
'do not practise your old way of snatching
'a phrase or expression out of a single *Author*,
'a *School-man* or *Controvertist*, making the
'whole *Church* answerable for one mans in-
'discretion. But search what the *Church* her
'self has declared in the *Council of Trent*: I-

Conc. Trid. Sess. 25.

magines Christi, &c. in Templis præsertim retinendæ, &c. *Images of Christ*, &c. *ought to be reteined in Churches especially, and due honor and veneration exhibited to them, not that there is believed any Divinity or Vertue in them, for which they ought to be worshipped, or that they are to be petitioned for any thing, or any confidence to be repos'd in them, but because the honor exhibited to them is referred to the Prototypes they represent.* 'Dispute
'against this as well as you can; and be assu-
'red you shall either be answered, or told you
'are *unconquerable*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XV.

The Roman Churches Prudence in reſtraining the too free uſe of Scripture from the Unlearned. The miſeries of this Kingdom juſtly aſcribed to a defect in ſuch Prudence. Of Prayers not in a Vulgar Tongue; The Cauſes and Grounds thereof. That practiſe not contrary to St. Paul.

1. DOctor *Pierce* his next (which is a double) *Novelty*, regards not any *Doctrines*, but only a Point of *Diſcipline* in the Church, which is, *The with-holding Scripture from the Vulgar, and practiſing public Devotions in an unknown Tongue.* Concerning the former, he ſaies, *The Scriptures were written in Hebrew, the mother-tongue of the Jew: and in Greek, a Tongue moſt known to Eaſtern* Serm. pag. 26.

Nations: And afterwards were translated into the Dalmatick by St. Hierom, *into the Gothick by* Vulphilas, *into the Arminian by St.* Chrysostom, *&c. and the Vulgar Latin was anciently the Vulgar Language of the* Italians, *&c.*

2. Truly the *Doctor* has, if it be well consider'd, made choice of a very proper season to renew a quarrel against the *Roman Church*, upon this Point, and to endeavour the engaging *his Majesty* in it, as if the calamities already hapned, both to the Royal Family, and the whole Nation, were either too little, or not to be imputed chiefly to that Error. He, and all *Christendom*, has seen the blessed effects that this prostituting *Scripture* to the passions and lusts of the rude and common people of all Conditions, Ages and Sexes, has wrought the last twenty years in this *Kingdom*. What was it but *Scripture* (as it was used, and of which ill use themselves were the first causes, and hereafter will never be able to prevent) that justified Discontents against the *Government*, both *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical*; that put *Swords* and *Guns* into the hands of *Subjects* against their *Kings*, and all that were faithful to them; that dissolved the entire frame of the Kingdom; that encourag'd men to Plunder, and all manner of Rapines; that Arraign'd and Murther'd our last most Excellent *KING*, that endanger'd his now living *Son*, our *most gracious Kings* life, and forced him into a long necessitous

ſitous baniſhment; that has revived and given ſtrength to old and new *Monſters* of *Hereſies*, to the aſtoniſhment of Man-kind, ſome of which are no where elſe to be ſeen, and the reſt in no place ſo venomous, as in *England*: Let but the *Doctor* remember how much miſchief the perverſe interpretation of this one Text, which none but the ignorant could miſtake, produc't in this Nation: *Having a form of godlineſſe, but denying the power thereof.* How did this ring in their ears, and ſtir them up to reject and hate all ſet-forms of Prayer! How, with this Text alone, often repeated, and induſtriouſly enlarged, and zealouſly apply'd by the holy Lecturers, were their very hearts ſet on fire to burn the grand Idol of the Common Prayer Book! And yet, after all this, the *Doctor* makes or renews quarrels with the *Roman Catholic Church*, becauſe ſhe is unwilling, by imitating them, to give a birth from her bowels to ſuch miſchiefs as theſe.

3. Yet it cannot be deny'd, that *Doctor Pierce* was ſubtile, for having a deſign (in recompence of the ſervice *Roman Catholicks* have done them) to expoſe them to the common rage of all theſe *Monſters*, he could not make choice of a ſubject more proper for his purpoſe than this, in which alone they were all intereſſed, not for the good they reap by *Scripture*, but becauſe without it, they would not have the advantage to do half ſo much miſchief.

4. Yet muſt he not think he can ſo blind mens eyes, but they know well enough that *Engliſh Proteſtants* are in their very Souls grieved, That 'tis now too late for them to endeavor how they may imitate both the Prudence and Charity of *Catholic Churches* in the diſpenſing of *Scripture*. Our *Paſtors* do not, as he wrongfully ſeems to charge them, forbid the *Tranſlation of Scripture* into *Vulgar Tongues*, ſince there is ſcarce any Nation but hath it. There are Catholic *Tranſlations* of the *Scripture* into *Engliſh*, *French*, *Dutch*, *Italian*, *Spaniſh*, &c. for the uſe of thoſe of the *Laity*, who are by their *Spiritual Guides* judged ſuch, as that they may reap benefit and no harm by the reading thereof. And what more doth the *Preacher* ſhew in the practiſe of the ancient times, in ſaying that the Holy Scriptures were then tranſlated into the *Dalmatick* Tongue by St. *Hierom*, then I ſhew in juſtification alſo of the later times (which he would here condemn) in ſaying as truly, that the Holy Scriptures are alſo found tranſlated long ago in *Wicliffs* the Reformers time, by the allowance and Authority of the Catholic Church (of which thus Dr. *Fulk*) *That the Scriptures were extant in Engliſh both before and after* Wicliffs *time, and not of his Tranſlation, beſide your conjecture out of* Lindwood, *it is manifeſtly proved by ſo many ancient Writers Copies of the* Engliſh Bible *differing in Tranſlation, yet to be ſhewed, of which* Wicleffs

Tranſlation

Tranſlation could be but one. Or in ſaying, That the ſame Holy Scriptures have been Tranſlated alſo of late, ſince *Luthers*, a ſecond Reformer's time, with the allowance of the ſame Church Catholic, by the induſtry of the Rhemiſh Divines.

But Catholic Governors, knowing how impoſſible it is for ignorant Perſons to underſtand it, and for paſſionate minds to make good uſe of it, eſteem it more conduceing to their edification and the common peace, that ſuch eaſily miſled Souls ſhould be inſtructed in their *Duties*, both as *Chriſtians* and *Subjects*, by plain *Catechiſms* and *Inſtructions* prudently and ſufficiently, with all plainneſſe gather'd out of *Scripture*, then that the *Bible* ſhould be put into their hands, a Book, the tenth part whereof ſcarce concerns them to know, and in which the ſeveral Points wherein they are concern'd are ſo diſperſed in ſeveral places, ſo variouſly, and ſomtimes ſo obſcurely, and ſo dubiouſly expreſſed, that all the learning and ſubtilty of *Doctors*, ſince it was written till theſe daies, have been exerciſed in enquiring, comparing, diſcuſſing ſeveral Texts, and clearing the true Doctrine of them fit for the conception of vulgar capacities. The whole Direction, neceſſary to govern *Paſtors* in their permitting others to read the Holy Scripture, is fully and excellently contain'd in that one Text of the Second Epiſtle of St. *Peter*, 3. 16.

Wherein (the Epiſtles of St. *Paul*) *there are certain things hard to be underſtood, which the unlearned and unſtable pervert* (*as alſo the other Scriptures*) *to their own perdition*. Two ſorts of Readers are here plainly forbidden by the Apoſtle; for certainly none of them who we know are apt to pervert the Scriptures, ſhould be permitted to read them. Conſider then how far theſe two words reach, *unlearned and unſtable*: I doubt, to ninety nine of every hundred in *England*: Which if admitted, not above one in a hundred, were good diſcipline obſerv'd, would be allowed to read the Bible.

Nor can it be Objected (*as uſually Proteſtants do*) that the Scriptures are ſafely clear to every one in *Fundamentals*, and miſtakable onely in Points of leſſer conſequence, ſince the very Text ſaies, they are both hard to be underſtood, and pervertible to the *perdition* of their Readers; and if ſuch Points as import Salvation or Damnation be not Fundamental, I'm utterly ignorant of the meaning of that word. Let then the *Learned*, and the *ſtedy* Chriſtian read, and ſtudy, and meditate the Bible as often and as long as he will, every Catholic will commend him, but by no means ſhould that liberty be given to the *unlearned and unſtable*, leſt the Scripture it ſelf condemn it, as a boldneſſe that may endanger their eternal Salvation.

And 'tis obſerveable in King *Henry* the 8*th*. who

who, after he had cauſed the Engliſh Bible to be publiſh't, ſo as to be read by all without any reſtraint, was forc't again, after three years experience (wherein he ſaw the many ſtrange and horrid opinions riſing among the ignorant people by occaſion thereof) by a new Act of Parliament to abridge the liberty formerly granted, and to *prohibit upon the penalty of a months Impriſonment* toties quoties, *that any Woman, Husbandman, Artificer, Yeoman, Servingman, Apprentice or Journyman Labourer, &c. ſhould read them to themſelves or to others, privatly or openly.* See Stat. 34, 35. Hen. 8. 1. *Becauſe* (ſaith the Preface of that Statue) *his Highneſs perceived that a great multitude of his Subjects, moſt eſpecially of the lower ſort, had ſo abuſed the Scriptures, that they had thereby grown and increaſed in diverſe naughtie and erroneous Opinions, and by occaſion thereof fallen into great Diviſions and Diſſentions among themſelves.* And if you ſay, the Opinions the King calls here *erroneous*, were the Proteſtant Doctrines, diſcovered by the Vulgar from the new light of the Scriptures, you may ſee the very Opinions, as the Biſhops collected them in *Fox, pag.* 1136. un-ownable by any ſober Proteſtant or Chriſtian. A thing perhaps not unworthy the ſerious conſideration of the preſent Governors, who have ſeen the like effects in theſe daies.

See Injunctions A. D. 1536 1538. (*Fox. p.* 1000.) ſet forth by *Cromwel.* Stat. 34, 35. *Hen.* 8. c. 1.

5. But as for other *Lay-perſons* of better judgment

judgement and capacities, and of whose submission to the *Churches Authority*, and aversion from *Novelties* sufficient proofs can be given, *our Ecclesiastical Governors* are easily enough entreated, yea, they are well enough enclin'd to exhort them to read the *Scriptures* themselves in their vulgar Tongues, and are forward to assist them in explaining difficulties, and resolving doubts that may occurr.

6. And now let *Doctor Pierce* speak his Conscience, if he dare do it; Is not this way of managing the Consciences of Christs Flock and this prudent dispensing of *Scripture* very desireable, yea actually in their hearts here in *England*, that it may be in practise among them? But it is now too late: Their *first Reformers* found no expedient so effectual to call followers to them out of *God's Church*, as by wastfully powring this *Treasure* into their hands, and accusing the *Church* for not doing so, not fore-seeing, or not caring, if, in future times, that which was an instrument of their Schism, from the true *Church*, would be far more effectual to multiply *Schisms* from their false one. For the making an ill use of *Scripture* by ignorant or passionate *Laicks* is not altogether so certain or probable to follow in the *Catholic Church*, where men are bred up in a belief and most necessary *Duty* of *Submission* even of their minds to her *Authority* for the delivering of the

the only true ſence of *Scripture*: Whereas in ſuch *Churches* as this, in which not any one Perſon ever was or can be perſwaded that the ſence of *Scripture* given by them can challenge an internal aſſent from any, or that it may not without ſin be contradicted; to give the Scripture indefinitly to all who can read or are willing to hear it read, without a Guide to tell them the true ſenſe which they are bound to believe, is to invite them to aſcend into *Moſes Chair*, which ſuch Reformer's themſelves have made empty and vacant for them.

7. The *ſecond Part* of this pretended *Novelty* concerns *Public Praying in an unknown tongue: which*, ſays he, *may be fetcht indeed as far as from* Gregory *the Great* (that is, ever ſince this *Nation* was *Chriſtian*:) *But is as ſcandalouſly oppoſite to the plain ſence of Scriptures, as if it were done in a meer deſpight to* 1 Cor. 14. 13. *&c. And, beſides* Origen, *it is confeſs'd by* Aquinas *and* Lyra, *that in the Primitive times the public Service of the Church was in the common Language too. And as the Chriſtians of* Dalmatia, Habaſſia, *&c. and all Reformed parts of Chriſtendom have God's ſervice in their vulgar tongues, ſo hath it been in divers places by approbation firſt had from the Pope himſelf.* Serm. p. 9. Ibid. p. 27.

8. I will acknowledge to *Doctor Pierce*, that this is the only Point of *Novelty* (as he calls it) of which he diſcourſes ſenſibly, and as it were to the purpoſe: But withall I muſt tell him, it is,

is, becauſe he miſtakes our *Churches* meaning. For he charges the *Catholic Religion*, as if one of its poſitions were, That Gods publick Service ought to be in an unknown Tongue, or as if it forbad people to underſtand it. And truly if it were ſo, we could never hope to be reconciled with that paſſage of *Scripture* out of *St. Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 13, &c. *But all* this is a pure miſ-underſtanding. Therefore I deſire him to permit himſelf for once to be informed how the matter ſtands in this *Point* with the *Roman Catholic Church.*

9. We *Roman Catholics* (I.) do willingly acknowledge, that in the *Primitive* times the *Public Service* of God was (generally ſpeaking) perform'd in a Tongue better underſtood than now it is, yet not then for many places and Countries in their vulgar, or native, or beſt underſtood tongue; For it is evident by St. *Auguſtin* that in *Afric* it was in the *Latin* tongue, not in the *Punic*, which yet was the only *Tongue* the *Vulgar* underſtood. So the Liturgy of St. *Baſil* was uſed in the Greek Tongue in moſt parts of the Eaſtern Churches. And yet it appears as well out of later Hiſtory, as out of the *Acts* 2. 8, 9, 10. & c. 14. *v.* 11. That Greek was not in thoſe antient times the vulgar tongue of many of thoſe Eaſtern Countrys, no more than Latin was of the Weſtern. 2. We profeſſe it was not, nor yet is the intention of the *Church* that the *Publick Devotions* ſhould therefore be in *Latin*, becauſe

De Doctr. Chriſt. l 2. c. 12, 13. Expoſit. Pſal. 123. Expoſit. inchoata Epiſt. ad Romanos.

cauſe it is not vulgarly underſtood: but this has happned as it were by accident, beſides her intention, and onely becauſe the *Latin Tongue*, in which it was firſt written, by revolution of times and mixture of *Barbarous Nations* in *Europe*, has been corrupted, and ceaſed to be a ſo commonly underſtood Language by unlearned people; for indeed probably it was never ſo well underſtood, as that other native Language which they uſed before it, or with it.

10. Matters ſtanding thus, yet the *Church* does not think fit to change with the times, but continues *Gods publick Service* as it was at firſt: And this we may conceive ſhe does. 1. *Becauſe* no example can be found in antiently-eſtabliſhed *Churches*, that any of them changed the Language of *Gods public Service* entirely. The *Greeks* now uſe the Antient *Maſſe* of *St. Chryſoſtom* written in *pure Greek*, as much differing from the Vulgar, as *Latin* from the *Italian*, *Spaniſh*, &c. The like may be ſaid of the *Syrian*, *Cophtites*, &c. among whom the *Maſs* is celebrated in the old Language, far from being vulgarly underſtood. Yea, the *Jews* continue their *Devotions*, to this day, in the *Hebrew*, underſtood by few among them. 2. Becauſe, though the *Latin* be not now in any place a *vulgar Language* yet there is no Language ſo univerſally underſtood in *Europe* as that: And a great fitneſſe there is that the moſt *Public Service* ſhould be in the moſt *public Language*, in which

which all Nations may joyn every where. And by those who most frequently recite the *Divine Service* in the *Catholic Church*, viz. the *Clergy*, and other *Religious* (for whose proper use a great part of this *Service* was composed) the *Latin Tongue* is well understood. 3. Because the *Latin Tongue* now that it is not vulgar, being thereby becom unchangeable, the Churches Doctrins contain'd in her *Liturgies* are so much the more freed from the danger of being innovated. Whereas *vulgar Languages* almost in every age become unintelligible, or at least sound very unpleasing in mens ears, as we now see in King *Edward the sixth's Common-prayer-book*: would it not seem an odd translation now to read, that Saint *Philip baptiz'd the Gelding?* and *Paul the Knave of Jesus Christ*, yet this was once the English Scripture; Nay more, within this *twenty years* we find many words and phrases have quite changed their former sense: So that all Nations must be ever and anon altering their *Liturgies*, to the great danger of changing the *Churches* belief; And (which is not altogether inconsiderable) for the present good husbandry of the world, to the infinite *expenses* of moneys in printing. &c.

11. I doubt not but he will reply that not any one, or all these commodities can answer and satisfie for an express, and, as he calls it, *a scandalous opposition to the plain sense of Scripture*, 1 *Cor.* 14. I grant it: All these *commoditiet*

*ditie*s are to be deſpiſed, rather than ſo to oppoſe the *Apoſtles Doctrin*. But what is his *Doctrin*? For I evidently perceive the *Doctor* has not well ſearch'd into it, much leſſe, rightly apply'd it. The *Apoſtle* ſays. *If I pray in an unknown tongue, my Spirit prays, but my underſtanding receives no benefit, &c. And how can an unlearned Perſon ſay Amen to ſuch Prayers?* In which paſſage ſeems involved a tacite prohibition at leaſt of publick Prayers in an unknown tongue. All this is granted: but yet with this exception mention'd by the *Apoſtle* himſelf, *unleſs either he that prays, or ſome other interpret*. Therefore before he took on him to charge the *Catholic Church* with a *ſcandalous oppoſition to this paſſage of Scripture*, he ought to have examin'd better her *doctrin* and practiſe: otherwiſe he himſelf will be found guilty of a *Scandalous oppoſition to God's Church*.

Now for a tryal of the *Churches* ſence, let him obſerve the Ordinance of the *Council* of *Trent* touching this very Point: the words are theſe, *Though the Maſs contain inſtruction for Gods faithful people, yet it ſeem'd not expedient unto the Fathers that it ſhould be celebrated every where in the vulgar tongue; wherefore retaining in all places the Churches antient Rite, approved by the holy Roman Church, the Mother and Miſtreſſe of all Churches; leſt Chriſt's Sheep ſhould hunger, and Children asking bread, none ſhould be found to break it to them,* Conc. Trid. Seſſ. 22. cap. 8.

them; the Holy Synod commands all Paſtours and all that have care of Souls, that during the celebration of Maſs, they ſhould frequently either by themſelves or others, expound ſome part of thoſe things which are read in it; and among other things let them explain the myſtery of this moſt Holy Sacrifice, eſpecially on Sundays and Feaſts. The *Preacher* here may ſee that the *Church* does not make ſuch a ſecret even of the moſt ſublime Myſteries of her Office, as *the Court* believ'd upon his report.

12. Likewiſe between this ſpeaking in an unknown tongue, mention'd by St. *Paul*, and the Churches publick Latin Service, there is this great diſparity; that this later is always a known Language to ſeveral of thoſe preſent, if not to all, and there are alwayes thoſe who underſtandingly ſay, *Amen*. And again being a known ſet-form in one ſet-language, recurring continually the ſame according to the Feaſt, thoſe who are ignorant of it at firſt, need not continue ſo, but by due attention, and other diligence may arive to a ſufficient knowledge at leaſt of the chief parts thereof, they having alſo in their *Manuals*, *Primers*, *Pſalters*, &c. ready tranſlated both the Pſalms, Hymns and Prayers, &c. and there being ſeveral Books both in Engliſh and all vulgar languages, that expound the Church-ſervice even to the meaneſt capacity. Neither is the Latin tongue, by reaſon of its affinity with many vulgar tongues, and of the conſtant uſe thereof,

hereof, a language unknown to ſuch a degree in Catholick Conntries, as our Engliſh Nation imagin it, and therefore is ſo much ſcandalized: Neither is there the ſame motive for ſome diſpenſation of a change in thoſe places, as perhaps would be in a Country leſs acquainted with the Latin, and of a Language more remote from it. Yet our venerable *Beda* in his Hiſtory ſaith, That in his time to theſe Northern Languages of ours, *Engliſh*, *Scotch*, *Britans*, *Picts*, *the Latin Tongue, by peruſing the Scriptures, was made common to them all.* The uſual Language therefore wherein the Scriptures were delivered in his times was Latin, and by this that Tongue rendred common, and not unknown even to theſe Northern people. Bed hiſt. l. 1. c 1.

13. Beſides all this, ſeveral Popes, Patriarks, &c. have approved the Tranſlation of the Miſſal, &c. into the vulgar Languages, as Pope *John* the Eighth, who was induced thereto by a Miracle related by *Æneas Silvius* (afterward Pope *Pius* the Second) likewiſe Pope *Innocent* the Third, Pope *Leo* the Tenth, *Balſamon*, Patriarch of *Antioch*, &c. Hiſt. Boem. cap. 13.

To conclude, ſince the Doctor confeſſeth that Popes have given leave to ſome Churches that the Divine Office ſhould be in a vulgar Tongue, he ought not to have made a Quarrel of this to a Separation, till it could be ſhewed, that their firſt Reformers had demanded a diſpenſation, and been refuſed.

CHAP. XVI.

Of Invocation of Saints: Proved out of Antiquity. Conceſsions: Deductions: And Objections anſwered.

1. THe next ſuppoſed *Novelty* is *the Invocation of Saints departed*: which ſays *Doctor Pierce*, *is no doubt an aged error, though not ſo aged as they would have it, (for the gaining of honor to the invention) becauſe St.* Auguſtin *does deny it to have been in his dayes.* Serm. p. 9.

2. Though perhaps the *Preacher* may for ſome ends be unwilling, yet that other *Proteſtants* may ſee the *Innocence* of the *Church* in this *Point*, and how free ſhe is from any intention of deterring any one from having acceſs in *Prayer* to our *Lord* immediately; or of diminiſhing the all-ſufficient vertue of our *Lords Merits* and *Interceſſion*; or of inducing men to ſecurity by relying on the holyneſſe and

and interceſſion of others, and neglecting the means of Salvation themſelves, &c. (which are generally the grounds upon which *Proteſtants* condemn this practiſe:) I will firſt ſet down the *Churches Deciſion*: And next, in order to demonſtrate the reaſonableneſſe of it, I will ſhew, for preventing ſuch prejudices, what conceſſions are generally made by *Catholics*. Thirdly, I will confirm the *Churches* practiſe by the *Teſtimonies* of the *Primitive times*. And laſtly, anſwer the *Doctors* only argument.

3. *Firſt*, then touching the *Churches Doctrin*, contained in the *Council of Trent*, *The Holy Synod commands all Biſhops and others who ſuſtain the Office and care of teaching, that, according to the uſe of the Catholic and Apoſtolic Religion received from the primitive times, the conſent of the Holy Fathers, and the Decrees of the Sacred Councils, eſpecially touching the interceſſion and invocation of Saints, &c. that they diligently inſtruct the Faithful, teaching them, that the Saints reigning together with Chriſt, do offer their Prayers to God for men, and that it is good and profitable humbly to invocate them, and to have recourſe to their Prayers, help and aſſiſtance for the obtaining of beneſits from God by his Son Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour. Let them likewiſe teach, that thoſe who deny that the Saints, enjoying eternal felicity in Heaven, are to be invocated; or who affirm either that they do not* Conc. Trid. Sels. 25.

pray for men, or that the invocating them to pray for us in particular alſo, is Idolatry, or that it is repugnant to Gods word and contrary to the honor of the one Mediator between God and Men Jeſus Chriſt; or that it is a fooliſh thing to ſupplicate with words or mind to them reigning in heaven [impie ſentiunt] *are impiouſly perſuaded.*

4. In the *ſecond* place, in conformity to the doctrin of this *Decree*, Catholics believe and acknowledge. 1. That we have *only one Mediator Jeſus Chriſt*, to whom only belongs the *Merit* that by it's juſt worth redeems us from eternal Death, and purchaſes for us eternal life: As likewiſe that as his *Merits* by ſatisfaction, ſo alſo his *Interceſſion* is all-ſufficient by way of impetration, to obtain all bleſſings for us. 2. Yet cannot it be deny'd but *our Lords interceſſion* is not actually and abſolutely beneficial to all, but that ſome Duties and qualifications on our part are neceſſary both that his *Merits*, and the benefits of his *Interceſſion* ſhould be effectually applyed unto us. 3. Among theſe Qualifications we are to reckon not only our own Prayers for our ſelves, but mutual Prayers for one another: which therefore we may beg from one another, as St. *Paul* himſelf did from the *Epheſians*, *Coloſſians*, &c. 4. Becauſe the more holy any perſon is, the more effectual will his *Interceſſion* be with God, therefore we may beg of known *Saints* their Prayers to God for us with greater hope of ſucceſſe. 5. Such

Epheſ. 6. 19.
Coloſ. 4. 3.
1 Th. ſ. 5. 1.

beg-

begging of Prayers is farr from *Idolatry*, *Superſtition* or *diminution to Chriſt's honor*, ſince holy Perſons (living or dead) are not invocated as *Donors* but Fellow-beggers with God for us. 6. Though a *Chriſtian* may be ſaved who prays to God alone, and requeſts not the prayers of others, yet to refuſe the aſſiſtance of thoſe, whoſe Prayers God more willingly hears, is a neglect at leaſt of uſing all means helpful to us. 7. Nevertheleſſe we ſay with Saint *Chryſoſtom*, *God will beſtow ſalvation much rather on us praying for our ſelves, than for others praying for us: And we are much more ſafe by our own Devotions (without others) then by others (alone:) And therefore we ought not to be ſlothful and ſecure, depending on others merits. For the prayers and ſupplications of Saints have indeed very great force with God in our behalf, but it is then truly when we with penance and humiliation beg the ſame thing alſo of God.* And therefore ſaith the ſame Saint, *Knowing theſe things, let us neither negligently contemn the prayers of Saints, nor caſt our ſelves wholly upon them.* Chryſoſt. hom. 23. in Genes. Id. hom. 1. in 1 Theſ.

5. Whatſoever hath been hitherto ſaid, may indifferently be applied as well to *Saints departed*, as to *Saints alive*: If the Prayers to *Saints* departed be prejudicial to the merits & interceſſion of our Lord, ſo is the beging of the prayers of thoſe alive: If one be unlawful, ſo is the other: nay, moſt certain it is, that if both be

lawful, the prayers of *Saints* departed will be incomparably more effectual, and therfore will better deserv to be made use of, than the other. Therefore, notwithstanding most of the *Arguments* of *Protestants* against the *Doctrin* of the *Church* touching *Invocation of Saints* departed, do prove full as much against Prayer to the Living, and therefore are evidently unconcluding: Yet those, who are most learned and sober, and will not wilfully mistake *Catholic Doctrin*, do free us from all imputation of *Idolatry*, *superstition*, or doing injury to *Christ*, and reduce the Controversie to a short point: For they question not whether the *Saints* pray in general for us, but rather willingly acknowledge it; yea they will not positively deny but they may and do pray personally for their former known acquaintance, as St. *Augustin* believ'd his *Mother* did for him: Likewise they will grant that though they be in Heaven, they may either by Gods revelation, or by relation from *Angels* be informed of the Prayers made to them by any others on earth: and that supposing such a knowledge, they will become Intercessors for them in particular.

6. But, you'l say, since there is no general certainty, that they understand our Prayers or wants, or intersesse themselves in the particular necessities of the living, Therefore though it be not unlawful, as prejudicial to the honor and duty we owe to *God*, to invo-

cate

cate them in particular, yet it may be call'd unlawful, in regard it is uncertain.

To this *Scruple*, *Catholicks* acknowledg the *Church* by no *Decision* hath declar'd that the *Saints* generally hear all the particular prayers of us on Earth: And consequently that it is not any *Article* of our *Faith* to believ they do so: Yea, several moderate *Catholics* refuse to say peremptorily that it is so; yet in all *Catholics* Opinion this does not, nor ought to hinder them from acknowledging that the practise of *Invocating Saints* by name, is very beneficial to us, though they should have no particular knowledge of your Prayers.

7. And the grounds to prove this to be rational are these, *First*, Because though it were so that the *Souls* of glorifi'd *Saints* did not hear our prayers, or know our particular necessities, yet at least, it is certain the *Holy Angels* are continually present with us on Earth, and that it is by them we are defended from the *Divels* malice, who otherwise, having such a wonderful strength exceeding ours, would destroy us all in our sins. Now, since *God* does not ordinarily interpose his power immediatly in natural actions, nor substract his universal influence on his Creatures, it cannot be imagin'd (since the *Devils* will not be hindred by any Law or prohibition) by what other power, but that of *Angels*, they should be restrained from executing their malice against us. Adde

to this, that *History* tells us *Magicians* have the *Divels* alwaies ready to come at their call: Why then should not *Angels* be witnesses of our actions, and especially our prayers, which, as the Scripture saies, *They offer as Incense to God*, being alwaies assistant in the houses of *Prayer*. This being supposed, we are not to imagin that those holy Spirits stand upon *niceties*, and will not do any good unlesse particularly call'd upon: But on the contrary, will be charitably officious in helping and delivering us, whensoever we implore the assistance of any of their fellow Citizens. And it is upon this matter that St. *Augustin*, not doubting at all that great good arrives unto us by invocating the *Martyrs*, &c. (for the beginning of his Discourse is, *Although that Question doth exceed the power of my understanding, How Martyrs succor those which certainly are in effect aided by them*, &c.) very subtilly Disputes whether the *Saints* themselves hear us, or the *Angels* for them: And whether, when they seem to appear unto us, it be not the *Angels* which take their shape.

Aug. l. de cur. pro mort. cap. 16.

8. Again, How great the Spheare of the activity of the *Saints* glorified may be in respect of this whole visible World, we know little. That it is finite we know: But how far it may be extended, *viz.* their faculties of seeing, hearing, and operating, especially since the Ascension and Glorification of our Lord, we know not. Thus the Archbishop

biſhop of *Spalato*, no great Patron of Invocation of *Saints*: *I do not think it improbable*, ſaith he, *that there ſhould be aſſigned to every Angel and beatified Soul very vaſt ſpaces both of the Superior and Inferior World, wherein they may operate: And perhaps the whole ſenſible world may be no more to one of them, than its proper body is to a humane Soul informing it.* And thus *Voſſius* interprets St. *Hieroms* Speech of them; *That he held beatified Souls preſent at their Tombs, and like Angels paſſing moſt ſwiftly through ſpaces wonderfully diſtant; moreover, that they there know the neceſſities, and hear the requeſt of thoſe who have recourſe to them.* But ſuppoſe their agency and intelligence, as Spirits, confined only to the Circuit of Heaven, yet how great the knowledge of theſe *Saints*, ſtanding continually in Gods preſence, may be by way of Revelation of things abſent or future, of mans thoughts, &c. in the ſame manner, (tho' in a higher degree,) as alſo ſome ſpecial *Saints* have on earth, who can determine? If God ſaid of *Abraham*, a Pilgrim on earth, *Shall I hide from Abraham the thing that I do?* How much more may we imagin that he hideth not the mighty works of his Providence, Mercy and Juſtice here on earth from thoſe his Domeſtick Servants? So we read, not onely an Angel, but every one of the *Twenty four Elders to have in their hands golden Cenſers, and Vials full of odors, which are the Prayers of Saints*; that is, of their Brethren on earth.

Spalat. de Rep. Eccl. l. 3. c. 6.

Voſſ. Diſp. Hiſt. 2. Theſ. 8.

Gen. 18. 17.

Rev. 8. 3. — Ibid. 5. 8.

9. Again,

9. Again, though there were no certainty in this, that even the *Angels* are present to us, and execute the things we pray for, yet the practise of *Invocating Saints* ought not to be neglected; because, considering the unquestionable proofs of a world of miraculous effects of such Prayers, both in modern and ancient times, recorded by the most Learned, Prudent, and Holy among the *Primitive Fathers*, of many of which themselves were eye witnesses, and the rest confirm'd by Testimonies irrefragable; *Miraculous effects* I say, not only of *Prayers* here directed to *God*, with relation to the acceptableness and *Intercession* of such *Saints*; but also of *Prayers* directed to the *Saints* themselves, as appears by the *Quotations* below: We may be assured that this practise pleases *Almighty God*, and is very beneficial to us. Among other witnesses of this, I will only name St. *Gregory Nyssen*, and *Theodoret* for the *Greek Church*, and St. *Augustin* for the *Roman*. The first of these in his Oration on the *Martyr St. Theodorus*: The second through his whole 8*th*. Book intituled of *Martyrs*; and St. *Augustin* in his 22*th*. Book *de Civitate Dei*, through several Chapters, shew both that frequent Addresses were made to, and many wonderful Miracles perform'd by the *Intercession of Saints*, especially *Martyrs*, which *Miracles* were shew'd rather in the places, where those *Martyrs* were particularly honour'd, and where

Greg. Nyss. or de S. Theod. Theodo. l. 8. de Marr. Aug. l. 22. de Civ. Dei. cap. 8. &c.

where their *Reliques* repoſed, then in others; and upon thoſe, who *Invocated* their *Interceſſion* and aſſiſtance, then on others, &c. which are demonſtrative proofs that the Veneration and *Invocation* of them are acceptable to *God*. St. *Auguſtin* relates that the multitude of Miracles which were done at *Hippo*, the Seat of his Biſhoprick, at the *Memory* of St. *Stephen*, and that within the two firſt years, after ſome part of his *Reliques* were brought thither from *Jeruſalem* by *Oroſius*, was ſo great (who alſo cauſed them to be enrolled, and for *God's* and the *Saints* glory, to be recited to the People the next Feſtival after they were done, of ſome of which alſo he was himſelf an eye-witneſſe) ſo great I ſay, as that thoſe that were regiſtred amounted to near 70. (whereof he ſets down a conſiderable number in that 8*th*. Chapter) and thoſe done at *Calama* to a far greater number. *It is not yet two years ſince the memorial at* Hippo Regius *was erected, whereas the Books delivered in to us concerning theſe miraculous effects (yet many other, as we are moſt certain, not being given in) even to the time when I am writing this, amount to ſome ſeventy. But at* Calama, *where the Memorial was ſet up ſooner, and the Books brought faſter, they are incredibly more in number. At* Uzala *too, a Colony adjoyning to* Utica, *we have been witneſſes of ſundry things of note done by the ſame Martyr; whoſe Memorial was erected there by Biſhop* Evodius, *long before ours.* And

De Civ. Dei. l. 22. c. 8.

St.

St. *Theodoret* also, (who was a member of the 3*d*. and 4*th*. General Council) speaks of the peoples frequent repairing and presenting their requests to the Martyrs for so many Miracles received by them on this manner ——— *Neither do we resort hither once or twice, or five times in a year, but frequently in them we keep our Festivals, yea, oftentimes for many daies together, we sing Lauds and Hymns to the Lord of these Martyrs. Where such as are in health petition the Martyrs for the continuance thereof; such as are sick petition them for health, &c. Not conceiting that they approach to Gods, but praying to these Martyrs of God as Divine men, invocating and petitioning them for their Intercessions with God. And that such, who have devoutly and faithfully invocated them, do obtain their requests, those several guifts do witnesse, which such, obliged by their Vows, do bring thither, being clear evidences of their unfeigned cures. For some hang up their Tablets of eyes, some of feet, others of hands, made of gold or silver. These things therefore exposed to the view of all, do evidence the driving away of their diseases: These I say do demonstrate, what the power of those Martyrs is, which are buried there,* &c. Thus *Theodoret*, whom, tho' some of the Reformed (upon a negative Argument, because *Nicephorus* mentions not this Book amongst others, but so he omits some which *Gennadius* mentions) deny to be the Author of this Book, yet *Rivet* is more candid, saying,

saying, *Libris de Græc. affect. curand. nonnulla addita esse malim dicere, quam de Authore dubitare.* And lastly, St. *Gregory Nyssen* speaks thus on the same Subject —— *After one hath thus delighted his eyes with the building, he desires further to approach the Monument it self, believing the very touching thereof to bring a benediction and hallowing along with it. But if any be suffered to take away any of the dust gathered from off the Martyrs Sepulchre, such dust is taken for a great guift, and this very Earth laid up as a precious Treasure. But if at any time such a happinesse befalls any, as to have the priviledge to touch the Reliques, how earnestly such a thing is to be wished and desired, being the reward of much importunitie, they know well, who have sought and obtained it. For then they view and embrace this body, as if it were alive and fresh; apply it to their mouth, their ears, and the other Organs of all their Senses: Moreover, powring out tears of duty and affection upon the Martyr, as if he appear'd to them sound and entire, they offer up their humble prayers, that he would intercede as an Advocate for them, begging of him as a Courtier of Heaven, and invocating him, as one that can obtain any thing he pleaseth. To what Prince is there such honour given?* River. Crit. Sacr. l. 4. c. 22.

10. In the third place I will adjoyn further expresse Testimonies out of the ancient Fathers, all living within the *Doctors* determinate times, and shewing the lawfulnesse and usefulnesse of this practise of *Invocating* the glorified *Saints*. Thus

Basil. Orat. 46. Mart.

Thus then saies St. *Basil*: *Whosoever is in any pressure, let him fly to the assistance of these Martyrs: And again, whoever is in a state of joy, let him pray to them: The former, that he may be delivered from misery: The latter, that he may be preserved in prosperitie.* Thus St. *Chrysostom*, *The Emperor, who is cloathed with purple, takes a journey to visit these Sepulchres* [of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*] *and laying aside his pomp, presents himself to make supplication to them, to the end they may intercede to God for him, he whose Temples are encompassed with a Diadem, praies to a maker of Tents, and a Fisherman, as his Protectors.* And to the same purpose, of the same *Emperor*, speaks *Ruffinus*. Thus St. *Ambrose*, *We ought to pray to the Angels which are given us for guards: We ought to pray to the Martys, whose Bodies seem to be as it were gages and hostages, that we may challenge their Patronage and protection, &c. Let us not therefore be asham'd to employ them as Intercessors for our Infirmities; for they themselves by experience knew the infirmitie of our bodies, even then when they surmounted it.* This St. *Ambrose* writ not, as *Bishop Andrews* imagins, when he was a *Neophite*, but a *Bishop*. See *Voss.* de *Invocat. Disp.* 2 *Thes.* 1. and *Forbs* de *Invocat.* cap. 3. their more candid concessions concerning this Father. Thus St. *Hilary*, *It is not the nature of God, but our infirmitie that stands in need of the Intercession of Angels: For they are sent for the benefit of those which shall inherit Salvation, God himself not being ignorant of the things*

Chrys. Homil. 66. ad pop. Antioch. & Hom. 26. in 2 Corinth.

Ruffin. Hist. Eccl. l. 2. c. 23.

Ambr. de vid.

Hilar. in Psal. 129.

which

which we do, but our infirmitie needing this myſtery of a ſpiritual interceſſion for the imploring and obtaining for us (what is good for us). In which Teſtimony ſo much is clear, that the Angels know our neceſſities, &c. And this is ſufficient to infer the lawfulneſſe of requeſting them alſo to intercede for us. To theſe, many more Teſtimonies may be added out of other holy Fathers, as likewiſe the actual Prayers to Martyrs made and recorded by St. *Baſil*, St. *Gregory Nyſſen*, St. *Gregory Nazianzen*, St. *Ephrem*, *Theodoret*, St. *Hierom*, St. *Paulinus*, *Prudentius*, &c. To which, I hope, Dr. *Pierce* will forbear to return the uſual evaſion, that all theſe are but Rhetorical Apoſtrophe's: Since other expreſſions of the ſame Fathers, *viz. That they are well perſwaded that thoſe Saints to whom they addreſſe theſe Requeſts, have an inſpection from Heaven on their affairs. That they do relieve the neceſſities of thoſe who ſupplicate to them. That the people make addreſſes to theſe heavenly Courtiers, as to thoſe who obtain guifts from God when they pleaſe. And that if the Lamb be every where, theſe Saints which are with the Lamb, ought to be believed to be any where,* (or every where) as they pleaſe: Since, I ſay, theſe expreſſions do not conſiſt with ſuch a pretence of their invocating them only in an empty flouriſh; And ſince this is a put-off too vain, to get any credit with ſober men, to ſay that ſuch grave and holy Biſhops, when preaching to the people, would

Nazianz. Orat. de 8. Athan. Baſil. Orat. de 40. Mart. Nyſſen. Orat. de S. Theodoro Mart.

would make petitions to these Saints to exercise their Rhetorick, and yet without any cautioning their hearers, that they did it in such a manner; which, if done seriously, would have been an injury to God, to Christ our Redeemer, yea, Idolatry, &c. And lastly, since the *Doctor* may find *Vossius* and *Forbes*, for some of them at least, condemning this evasion.

11. To these Testimonies, I may adjoyn the expresse confessions of *Protestants*, That *Invocation of Saints* was commonly in use in the Greek Church long before the 3*d*. and 4*th*. *General Councils*. For which, besides the confession of *Chemnitius*, *Vossius* also is clear, whose words are; *About the year of Christ*, 370. *those to whom the care of instructing the people was committed, did by their practise lead them to invocate the Saints departed. And indeed, in the Greek Church the first, or at least very near the first of those which gave such Examples were* Basil, Nyssen, Nazianzen: *And in the West, at the same time*, Ambrose *of* Millain, *a diligent Reader and Imitater of the Greeks, followed the same custom.* Now, since Dr. *Pierce* professes so ready a submission to the Judgment of the four first *General Councils*, and must grant, that several of these Fathers, whom *Vossius* acknowledges to have been Patrons of Invocation, and to have used it even in the publick Assemblies, (for which they were never censured) did precede many years two of these

Chem. exam. Conc. Trid. p. 3. de Invocat. S. S. Vossius Disp. 2 Thes. 1.

these *General Councils*; I would gladly know if such a Question had been made before the third or fourth Council, concerning *Invocation of Saints*, as was, before that of *Trent*, Whether he can perswade himself, that those Fathers would not have justified such Invocation for lawful in those Councils, which they practised as lawful out of, and before them, and would not have produced at least as high a stating of that Point, as the Council of *Trent* did? And indeed a particular knowledg and agency of Saints deceased in in human affairs seems to be acknowledged in the fourth *General Council*, and Invocation in the third Person: Whose words are, *Let Flavian be had in everlasting memory: Behold Vengeance*, [i.e. on his murderers] *Behold the Truth*! Flavian *lives after death*! *Let* Flavian *the Martyr pray for us.* Act 11. Conc. Chalced.

12. It remains in the last place, that an *Answer* be given to the only *Argument* out of *Antiquitie*, produced by the *Doctor* against this *Doctrine*, and to prove it's *Novelitie*. For, saies he, *St. Augustin denies invocation of Saints to have been in his daies*: And his only proof that he does so, is from those words of his, *The men of God* (that is Saints departed) *are named indeed in their due place and order, but they are not invoked by the Priest who Sacrifices.* Serm. pig. 9. Aug de Civ. D. lib. 22. c. 10.

12. To this passage, our Answer is, 1. That sure the *Preacher* had forgot he was to reckon, presently after, *the Sacrifice of the*

Masse among *Novelties*, introduced after the *fourth General Council*, when he produced this *Testimony* that expresly proves the contrary: Here is a *Sacerdos* brought in, and here he is brought in both praying and *Sacrificing* and yet, saies the *Doctor*, no such thing as any *Christian Sacrifice*. Or, if a Sacrifice, only a *Sacrifice* perhaps of *praise* and thanksgiving. But St. *Augustin* will contradict him, who as hath been said, calls this indeed *a Sacrifice of Thanksgiving in regard of glorified Saints commemorated in it: but a Sacrifice propitiatory in regard of the faithful departed with some stains of sins remaining*,

2. The same thing St. *Augustin* means here (i. e. *That Saints are not soveraignly invocated by way of Sacrifice, as the Supream Donors and Fountain of all good that descends to mankind,*) is tanght by the Catholic Church even where she professes Invocation of Saints in the same sense as St. *Augustin* allows it, that is, as of our fellow-members and citizens, making efficacious intercessions for us to this Supream Deity to whom we Sacrifice. For thus saies the *Council of Trent*, *Although the Church be accustomed to celebrate Masses sometimes in the honour and memory of Saints; yet she does not teach that the Sacrifice should be offered to them, but to God alone who has crown'd them: And hence it is that the Priest is never wont to say, O* Peter, *O* Paul, *I offer this Sacrifice to thee, but to God, to whom he gives thanks for their Victories, and implores their patro-*

Conc. Trid. Sess. 22. cap. 3.

patronage, that they may vouchsafe to intercede for us in Heaven, whose memory we celebrate on earth. A part of which *Decree* is taken out of *S. Augustin* himself in the same Treatise quoted by the *Preacher*. Aug. de Civ. D. l. 8. c. 27. & lib. 20. cont. Faust. M. c. 21.

3. Dr. *Pierce* could not possibly have made a worse choice of a place from whence to select a *Testimony* (as he would have us believe) denying *all Invocation of Saints*, whenas in the *two Chapters* of the same Book immediately preceding this, many stories are largely recounted to certifie the great good that *Christians* had found by the intercession of *Saints*, and all this, whilst in their *Oratories* they begg'd their intercession. Id. ib. l. 22. c. 8, 9.

4 Perhaps he will not yet be content: but with Bishop *Andrews* ‖ will urge, it is not here said by St. *Austin*, That the Saints are not Sacrificed to, but that they are not so much as invocated at the Altar. And if it be unlawful to invocate them there, it will be as well unlawful any where else. Hereto it is answered, That all this, taken in a right sense, is granted. For first, To this day in the Masse there is no kind of Invocation of Saints; yea more, according to the Council of *Carthage*, till the Consecration be perfected, there are no Prayers directed to the Son of God, nor to the Holy Ghost, but only to God the Father. 2. But this argues not that (if the Church had so order'd it) it might not have been lawful even at the Altar ‖ Resp. ad Apolog. c. 1. page 46. 3 Conc. Carth. cap. 23.

to have Invocated the Saints by such an inferiour Invocation or Compellation as the Church has determined, which is only according to *Card. Perron* [*prier pour prier*] to desire them to pray for us: As even in the Masse it self, the Priest requests the Assistants, saying, *Orate fratres, ut meum ac vestrum Sacrificium acceptabile fiat apud Deum, &c.* To whom the people Answers, *Suscipiat Dominus Sacrificium de manibus tuis, &c.* 3. But as for the Supream sort of Invocation, which St. *Austin* only intended in this passage, and which he calls *Cultum latriæ*, this is only due to God, and without impiety cannot be made to Saints: And thus St. *Austin* writing against *Faustus*, the *Manichean*, fully justifies what he saith in this passage.

Ord. Missæ.

Aust. cont. Faust. l. 20. c 21.

5. But after all this, that St. *Austin* allows Invocation of Saints in an inferior way, do but examin only these places in him — c. 4. *De curâ pro mortuis* (a Book which he wrote in Answer to a *Quere* of *Paulinus*, Whether it doth benefit any one after his death to have his body buried in the Memorial of some Saint) —— *When as* (saith he) *such consolations of the living are looked after* [that is, of burying their Friends in such sacred places] *whereby their pious affection may appear to their Friends. I see not what advantages may accrew* [hereby] *to the dead, except this; that whilst they call to mind where the Bodies of those who are dear unto them are laid, they with their Prayers com-*

men-

mend them to the same Saints, as it were to Patrons, that by them they may be helped with our Lord, which also they might do, although they could not inter them in such places. —Whensoever therefore the minde recounts, where the body of some dear friend lies buried, and streight the place occurs renown'd for the name of some Martyr, the devotion of him, who thus remembers and prayes, forthwith commends this beloved soul to the same Martyr.

—— 'There was here in *Hippo* (saith 'the same Father) a certain old man 'called *Florentius*, poor but pious, and a 'Tailor by Trade. He had lost his Cloak, 'and had nothing wherewith to buy him 'another. He prayed with a loud voice, to 'the twenty Martyrs, whose Monument 'here among us is very famous, to re-'apparel him. Some scoffing young men 'by chance being near hand, over-heard him, 'and at his going away followed him jeering 'him, as if he had begged of the Martyrs fif-'ty half pence to buy him clothes. —And af-'terward, —The Cook (*saith he*) cutting up 'the *Fish*, found in the belly of it a gold 'ring, which, moved with pity and piety to-'gether, he straightway delivered to the poor 'man, saying, See how the twenty Martyrs 'have furnished you with clothes. De Civ. Dei. lib. 22. cap. 8.

De diversis Serm. 32. & 33. (unquestioned that I know of, and which appear sufficiently

to be S. *Auſtins*, by comparing theſe with the concluſion of *cap.* 8. *l.* 22. *de Civit. Dei.* —'A certain woman (ſaith he there) loſt her 'ſon, a ſucking Infant, being as yet a Cate'chumen only. —Full of faith ſhe took the 'dead childe, and ran to the memorial of the 'bleſſed Martyr *Stephen*, and began of him to 'demand her ſon, and to ſay, Holy Martyr, 'you ſee I have no comfort at all left me; For 'I cannot ſo much as ſay that my ſon is gon 'before me (*to Bliſs*) whom you know is ut'terly periſhed (*becauſe dying unbaptized*). You 'ſee the cauſe of this my deſolate grief; re'ſtore me my Son, *&c.*

—— *De Baptiſmo. l.* 7. *c.* 1. — and *l.* 5. *c.* 17. being compared, This Father ſuppoſeth the Martyr *Cyprian* to know his affairs; and, in his handling that Controverſie of Rebaptization, contrary to St. *Cyprians* former judgment, (in which Point he preſumes that Saint now fully illuminated) yet hopes for his favour, and requeſts the aſſiſtance to him herein of his Prayers —— 'Let 'him help us therefore (ſaith he) with 'his Prayers, laboring here in the mor'tality of this fleſh as in a dark myſt, 'that by Gods help we may, as much as 'we can, imitate the good things that were 'in him.

De Invocatione Sanctorum. c. 4. n. 2.

6. Upon theſe grounds Biſhop *Forbes* grants, that St. *Auſtin* doth allow Invocation

on of *Martyrs*; commends Biſhop *Montagues* candor in acknowledging it; and there alſo cenſures Biſhop *Andrews* for denying it, in theſe words: 'The Biſhop of *Ely* wrongfully affirms that St. *Auſtin* diſallowed the Invocation of Saints, the contrary whereof 'is apparent in his Book *De curâ pro mortuis*, &c. And afterwards he adds, 'Truly I am 'ſorry, that ſo juſt a cauſe is given to *John* 'Barclay of expoſtulating with the moſt 'learned Biſhop of *Ely*, who ſpeaks thus 'concerning him —— Here I have a deſire to 'tell the King of Great Britain's Almoner: 'The King believes him, and ſo do many o-'thers; and yet he is as oft in fault, as he 'makes others to be ſo. Let him therefore 'conſider, how erroniouſly he denies that St. 'Auſtin approves the Invocation of Martyrs. Adde to Biſhop *Forbes*, and Biſhop *Montague*, the Teſtimony of Dr. *Fulk* long ago in his Rejoinder to *Briſſow* —— 'I acknowledge (ſaith he) 'St. *Ambroſe*, St. *Auſtin*, and St. 'Jerom held Invocation of Saints to be law-'ful, which is an Error —— And the Teſtimony of the Biſhop of *Spalato*, who numbers this Father among many others that allowed Invocation of Saints: 'The Fathers (ſaies he) 'without any heſitancy either Invocate 'Saints, or grant they may be invocated: 'the Latin; *Hilary*, *Ambroſe*, *Jerom*, *Paulinus*, *Maximus*, *Prudentius*, *Auguſtinus*, —— And the Teſtimony of *Chemnitius* alſo,

Page 5.

Republ. Eccl. l. 7. c. 12. n. 25.

Exam. Concil. Trid. 3. p. 197.

who, upon the former Quotation taken out of St. *Austin de Baptismo*, l. 7. c. 1. sayes, 'Thus St. *Austin* speaks without ground of 'Scripture, yielding to the times and com-'mon custom. Yet for all this, a confident pronouncing that St. *Austin* knew nothing of this Doctrine or Practice serv'd the *Preachers* turn: Many of his Auditors knew nothing to the contrary, and therefore believ'd him, and, according to his desire, detested *Roman Catholics* the more for this *Novelty*. And that was enough then; but what will it be when the Righteous Judge shall call that *Sermon* to a second account?

CHAP.

CHAP. XVII.

Celibacy of Prieſts. Vowes of Chaſtity: The Doctrine and Practice of the Church in both. Objections Anſwered.

1. THe Doctors tenth pretended *Noveltie*, is the *Roman Churches prohibition of Marriage to Prieſts and others in holy Orders: Which*, ſaies he, *is by ſome derived from the third Century, by others from the eighth; and in the rigour that now it is, from Pope* Gregory 7. *and by Roman Catholics themſelves, 'tis dated but from Pope* Calixtus. *But* (ſaies he) *both in the old and new Teſtament, Prieſts were permitted to have Wives: The Apoſtles were married: Beſides marriage of Prieſts was aſſerted by* Paphnutius *in the Council of* Nice: *And by one of the Apoſtolic Canons: And the forbidding of Marriage, with* Saturninus *and the* Gnoſticks, *is worthily called by the Apoſtle the Doctrine of Devils.* Serm. pag. 27. Ib. page 9.

2. *Indeed,*

2. Indeed if the prohibition of *Mariage* to ſome certain ſtates of men or women be *the Doctrin of Devils*, the *Preacher* has reaſon rather to ſeperate himſelf from a Church that enjoyns ſuch a *Diabolical vertue* as *Continence*, than from a wife that will not permit it, and who perhaps had therefore a great influence upon his zeal, more warm in this *Novelty* than any of the reſt. Though it is not only permitted him, but eſteem'd meritorious to blaſpheme the *Church of God*, yet let him take heed how he blaſphemes the *Apoſtle*, who, in the ſame Epiſtle out of which the Doctor quotes his *Doctrin of Devils forbids mariage to Widows*, who had conſecrated themſelves to our Lord's ſervice: *Younger Widows refuſe* (ſays he) *for when they have begun to wax wanton againſt Chriſt, they will mary*: *Having damnation, becauſe they have caſt off their firſt Faith. What means this phraſe* [*They have caſt off their firſt Faith*] (ſaith St. *Auguſtine*) [*Voverunt & non reddidérunt.*] *They vowed* (perpetual continence) *but they kept not their vow*: and therefore they *have damnation*. This is St. *Auguſtin*'s conſtant Doctrin and interpretation of that place of the Apoſtle, as may be ſeen by examining the quotations in the Margin. The ſame is taught by St. *Epiphanius*, St. *Hierom*, *Fulgentius*, *the fourth Council of Carthage*, (at which St. *Auguſtin* was preſent) &c. And it is not contradicted by any one *Antient Doctor*, nor any, except antient *Heretics*,

1 *Tim.* 5. 11, 12.
Aug. in Pſ. 95.
Id. *de bon. Vid* c. 8.
Id. *de Sanct. Virg.* c. 33, 34.
Id. *de adult. Conjug. l.* 1. c. 24, 25.
Id. *Epiſt.* 70.
Epiph. hier. 43, & 61.
Hieron. l. 1. *Cont. Jovin.*
Id. *in Ep. ad Furian.*
Fulg. Ep. 1. c. 6.
Conc. Carth. 4. c. 104.

tics, Jovian, Vigilantius, &c. And this surely will suffice to demonstrate it, no *Novelty* in God's Church, much less that it was esteem'd a *Doctrin of Devils*, to *forbid Marriage* to Persons consecrated to God's service. Forbid it; I say, not as the *Gnosticks, Manichees, &c.* forbad it, as an unlawful thing in it's self, but only as an impediment and distraction in a spiritual Vocation. Now whether *Widows* are esteem'd by the *Preacher* to be more nearly and perfectly consecrated to the *Divine service*, by the Office of *Deaconesses*, then men by *Priesthood*, 'tis expected he should declare.

3. But for better clearing of this *Point*, touching the *prohibition of Mariage to persons in holy Orders, &c.* in charity I must suppose the Doctor will not professe the *Heresie of Jovinian*, who taught that *Virginity does not excel Matrimony*. An Heresie so contrary to reason, that (as St. *Augustin* tells us) *it was presently extinguished and never could attain to the deceiving so much as one Priest*. This *Heresie* formally contradicts St. *Paul* teaching thus, *There is difference between a wife and a Virgin, The (Virgin) unmarried woman careth for the things of our Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit: But she that is married careth for the things of the world, how she may please her husband.* Which saying of the *Apostle* certainly at least declares *a state of Virginity* and continency much more advantagi-

Aug. in Hæres. 82.

1 Cor. 7. 34.

ous

ous to promote the ſervice of God and keep the mind fixed on ſpiritual and heavenly imployments, than a *Married ſtate*, encombred with worldly cares, and carnal appetites. Thus much I doubt not will by the *Preacher* be granted.

4. But now the Queſtion muſt be, whether *Eunuchiſm for the Kingdom of Heaven*, that is, a perpetual abſtinence from Marriage and all carnal luſts may lawfully be by Prieſts, &c. made the matter of a Vow? That it is a *Counſil of Perfection* is evident from our Saviours ſpeech, *Qui poteſt capere, capiat.* But upon ſuppoſition that Continency is a ſpecial *gift of God*, *not beſtow'd on all*, and that it is infinitely difficult for any one certainly to know he has this *Gift*: for theſe and ſuch like reaſons the *Reformed Churches*, in oppoſition to the *Roman Catholic*, have generally condemned the practice of ſuch *Vows*, at leaſt conſider'd as extending it ſelf generally to any whole *Order* or *ſtate* of men, and eſpecially an Obligation impoſed on them to this practice.

5. On the other ſide the *Roman Catholic Church*, though ſhe acknowledges *Continence* to be a ſpecial *Gift of God*, and that there may be ſome difficulty to attain and preſerve it, yet eſteems not theſe to be grounds ſufficient to relinquiſh the obligation of *Celibacy in Prieſts*, &c. which ſhe ſubmitted to from the *Preachers Beginning*, that is in the primitive times

of

of the *Church*, at leaſt within the *four firſt General Councils.*

6. It is granted then, that *Continency*, (that is an ability to abſtain (not from all motions of Concupiſcence but) from putting in execution all motions, either by a voluntary moroſe delectation in them, or much more by outward unclean practiſes of them) *is a Gift of God*, a fruit of his *Holy Spirit*, and cannot by natural means be obtained ſo as to be practiſed in obedience to him. But ſo are all Chriſtian vertues: So is *Faith*, ſo is *Repentance*, ſo is *Charity*, all which notwithſtanding, *we vow in our Baptiſm.* And why do we vow a practiſe of thoſe *vertues* which are pure *Gifts of God*? Becauſe we are aſſured the ſame God, who commands that *Vow*, will not be wanting to ſupply ſtrength to perform it, in all thoſe that ſincerely beg thoſe *Gifts* of him by earneſt Prayers made in Faith, and by avoiding all known, and poſſible-to-be-avoided impediments to the practiſe of thoſe vertues.

7. But it will be ſaid, that great difference is to be made between that *Continence* which is a *Chriſtian vertue* neceſſary to all; *viz.* a *Continence* from all unlawful Luſts; and ſuch a *Continence* as is now treated of, which is an *Abſtinence* from Marriage, that is from the lawful Remedies of unlawful Luſts, which *Abſtinence* is ſo far from being neceſſary to all, that it is no more than a *Council* to thoſe that aſpire *Obj.*

aſpire to perfection, which are but few, even in the opinion of the *Roman-Church*. This *Abſtinence* certainly is a *far more ſpecial* Gift of God, ſay they, and not too eaſily and commonly to be preſumed on.

Sol. 8. All this likewiſe underſtood *cum grano Salis*, is acknowledged by us. Yet withall *Proteſtants* know that even this *Abſtinence* from *Marriage*, or from exerciſing the lawful Acts in Marriage is a *Gift* beſtowed on very many, and in ſome caſes neceſſary to almoſt every one. For otherwiſe it would be utterly unlawful for Parents to keep their children unmarried after the time they are capable, and thereby to expoſe them to unlawful luſts, ſince it ſeems they are not ſure they have ſuch a *Gift*: it would be unlawful for *Merchants* and *Travellers* to make long voyages abroad, and leave their Wives at home deprived of the neceſſary lawful *Remedies* againſt *Luſt* and Temptations to which they are expoſed. All *Statutes* of *Colledges* ought to be repealed, which forbid *Marriage* ſtill to all *Fellows*, and heretofore to all *Preſidents*, upon penalty of forfeiting their whole ſubſiſtence. A long Sickneſs inflicted by God on either of the married Couples, would be far more dangerous to their Souls than their Bodies, ſo as if ſuch an Abſtinence, as is now ſpoken of, were ſuch an extraordinary *Gift* of Perfection, *England* would have more *Saints*, or more *Adulterers*, &c. than ſhe is aware of. And here good *Doctor*

I de-

I desire you tell me a thing that perhaps you have not thought on, yet will easily perceive its meaning assoon as you think on't. What is the reason that the Ministers of *England* generally marry not till they are above thirty years of age? Can they abstain all that while, when their passions are stronger, and their reason weaker, and then, after so long a Continency begin to plead 'tis impossible for them to hold any longer, unless they had the gift of Chastity, which God bestows not on every one? shall I give you my Conjecture? I doubt they force themselves to live single till they have a Benefice, and then, assoon as they can maintain a wife, they get one: is not this meer hypocrisie to talk of Marrying out of tenderness of Conscience, to allay their Concupiscence, when the danger is almost all past; and make no provision to prevent the sins of the unrulyest part of their age? Methinks they should either marry earlyer, when they may justly suspect their Chastity, before they have tryed themselves; or live longer Batchellors, when they may prudently hope by the grace of God to persevere after so much experience of their continency.

9. *Catholicks* therfore, though they confesse this *continence* to be a *special Gift of God not bestow'd on all*, because all do not use the means, yet resolve it is such a special gift as is denyed to none, who rightly seek it, and conceive, it also may be made the matter of a vow by those,

those, who have a steddy purpose to use the necessary means to attain and conserve it, and by those who by humble and due examining themselves, are perswaded that God calls them to a state of greater *Perfection*, and being in that state depend on his grace for performing their *Vow*, seeking his assistance by constant *Prayers*, watchfulnesse, and necessary penitential austerities. Now those may be confident they are called to such a state, either in a *Monastical* or *Ecclesiastical Profession*, who betake themselves thereto, not out of any worldly respects, for gaining a subsistence or preferment, or other temporal invitations, but purely to avoid the tentations, solicitudes and distractions of the world and flesh, and to devote themselves more to the service of God, and advancing their *Souls* in vertue and piety. In this state of *Perfection*, and in complying with this *Council* of *Perfection*, those, who duly undertake that state, may as undoubtedly promise to themseves Gods assistance whilst they use the means to obtain it, as generally all Christians may after the vow of *Baptism*. St. *Augustin* writes thus, *David* vow'd, *as having the matter in his own power: And yet he beggs with all of God that he may perform what he vow'd. Here is the devotion of one that vows: here is the humity of one that prays. Let no man presume on his own strength, as if he were able of himself to perform what he shall vow. He that exhorts*

Aug. in Psal. 131.

thee

thee to vow [saying *Vovete & reddite*] *the same God helps thee to perform what thou hast vow'd.*

10. If then it be lawfull for private persons to vow *Celibacy*, surely it is lawful for the Church to enjoyn it: her Doctrin being, *That God denies not the gift of Chastity to them who ask it aright, nor suffers us to be tempted above what we are able.* Which Doctrin is the ground why the Church enjoyns Celibacy to Priests: So that *Chastity* is called a *special Gift*, not in this sence, as if all men, though using what means soever, are not capable of it: But it is such a *Gift* as many men never actually receive from God, because they do not use the means: and such a *Gift* as few also will endeavour to use the means to attain, because these means are harder than those by which other *Gifts* may be attained. That the undertaking by *Vow* such a life of Chastity, and abstinence from Marriage, yea in Marriage it self, has been approv'd, commended, and practised in God's Church from the very beginning, if the *Preacher* will not believe us, let him not suspect at least partiality in his own best Friends. 'We 'are not ignorant, says *Chemnitius*, *that the* 'Fathers did approve the vows of perpetual Celi-'bacy, and acknowledge them to be obligatory. 'Profession and Vows of Chastity (says *Peter* 'Martyr) were extant among Christians in the 'time of *Clement* of *Alexandria* [that is about 'the year 170.] Again, I know, says he, that 'Epiphanius with many of the Fathers erred in

Conc. Trid. Sess. 24. Can. 9.

Chemnit. exam. part. 3. p. 41.

P. Mart. l. de vot. pag 490.

Id. ib. p. 514.

'this, that they ſaid it was a ſin to violate ſuch a 'Vow when it was requiſite, and that he did ill 'in referring it to Apoſtolic Tradition. *Da-*
Danæus contr. Bellarm. part. 1. part. altera. '*næus* ſays confidently, That St. *Auguſtin* and 'all the Biſhops in the Council of *Carthage* a-'buſed manifeſtly the word of *God*, ſaying, upon 'the Apoſtles words, If any widows how young 'ſoever have vowed themſelves to *God*, &c. 'and afterwards ſhall go to ſecular Marri-'age, they ſhall according to the Apoſtle have 'damnation: becauſe they dared to make void 'the vow of Chaſtity made to *God*. The 'Centuriſts affirm it to be manifeſt by the E-'piſtles of *Ignatius*, that in thoſe times men be-'gan to have too much liking of the Profeſſion 'of Virginity: for he ſays, Let Virgins conſi-'der to whom they have conſecrated them-'ſelves.

11. And as for the *Doctrin of Devils* mentioned by the Preacher, he may do well to ſit him down and conſider the words of the Apoſtle, and the comments of the Fathers on them a little better. Firſt he will find the Apoſtle, in his oppoſing thoſe, who in the latter times ſhould forbid to marry, and command to abſtain from meats, to argue againſt them thus: That every Creature and Ordinance of *God* is good (according to *Gen.* 1. 31. & 2. 23, 24.) and therefore, being ſanctified firſt by the word of *God* and Prayer, may lawfully be uſed. (See 1 *Tim.* 4. 3, 4, 5.) which plainly ſhews, that St. *Paul* means ſuch Apoſtates as abſtain from, or prohibit Marriage and Meats as in themſelves

selves unlawful and unclean and contaminating. Which thing can neither be objected to the antient nor modern Church-practise, using abstinence from some meats for the chastisement of the body, not for any uncleanesse in the food, and not forbidding Marriage to any single person absolutely, but only upon his voluntary undertaking such an employment, with which they imagin a married condition not so well to sute. In which case, if necessaty abstinence from Marriage be a fault, the Apostle himself may seem to comply with it in those expressions of his forementioned concerning the Widows, 1 *Tim.* 5. 11, 12. 2ly. He will find it manifest by experience, that this prophecy of the Apostle was most eminently fulfilled in other persons of these latter times (whom these Fathers even in these points most vehemently resisted) they affirming downright all Marriage, especially with reference to procreation of children (therefore the married were advised by them in such manner to use their Wives, as to avoid this: See *S. Aug. De Morib. Manich.* c. 18.) to be unlawful, and the work or dedesign of the Devil, as likewise flesh-diet to be unclean and defiling. *They forbid living Creatures as detesting them*, saith Epiphanius, *not in respect of preserving continency, or a virtuous life, but out of fear and fancy, that they might be defiled by eating such living Creatures. Wine they use not at all, saying, 'tis Diabolical.* And S. *Austin, Contra Faust. l.* 30. *c.* 5. *To call the Creature unclean, because the Devil* (ye say) Hæres. 47. Aug. con. Faust. l. 30. c. 5.

frames flesh out of the more feculent part of natural matter. Such were some of the *Gnosticks*, *Encratites*, *Montanists*, *Marcionites*, and in the last place the *Manichees*, who, not holding all things to have been created by the same good God, but this lower world by an evil Principle, or by the Prince of Darkness, as they call him, affirmed in the begetting of a man, that the Soul, which they account to be a part of the substance of God himself, becomes fettered and imprisoned in the walls or handy-work of the Devil, *i. e.* the body, and therefore was marriage, as occasioning such imprisonment, forborn by all their Elect; and though this was permitted to their Auditors, yet (saith S. *Austin*) it was *not by telling them it was no sin, but by shewing favour to the persons thus sinning, because they allowed them maintenance.*

Conc. Faust. Man. lib. 30.

3. Again he will find, that when they were accused by the Fathers for such errors, it was ordinary with them to recriminate the Orthodox with the same things, both for their frequent abstinences from flesh, and some other Fruits, and for their (to some Persons at least) recommending Virginity, who in this matter were answered by them after the same manner, as the Protestants, objecting the same things, are now by the Church Catholic. See *Chrysostom*, *Ambrose*, and lastly *Doctor Hamond* on this place of *Timothy*, understanding it of the same Heretics. Lastly he will find that *Faustus* the *Manichee* made the very same Objection to prove professed Chastity to be the *Doctrin*

trin of Devils. To whom *St. Auguſtin* thus answers, *I am now afraid in the behalf even of the Apoſtle himſelf, leſt he ſhould ſeem to have introduced the doctrin of Devils into* Iconium, *when by his Speeches he enflamed a young Maid already betrothed, to a love of perpetual Virginity*, and when he pronounced damnation to *Widows* tranſgreſſing their Vow. Aug. Cont. Fauſt. Man. l. 30. c. 4.

12. To come home to the *Celibacy* of Prieſts in particular, whereas the Doctor builds much on the *Authority* of *Paphnutius*, and the mind of the famous firſt General Council of *Nice* thereupon, let him conſider what an *Author* (not partial he may be ſure for the *Roman Church*) has ſaid of that Point, that is, *The Patriarc of Presbyterians, Mr. Cartwright, The Council of Nice* (ſays he) *did affirm and teach that to thoſe who are choſen to the Miniſtry unmarried, it was not lawful to take any wife afterward, only, being married before intrance into the Miniſtry, it was lawful for them to uſe the benefit of that precedent Marriage. And* Paphnutius *ſhews that not only this was before that Council, but was an antient Tradition of the Church, in which both himſelf and the reſt of the Council reſted*, for a motion being made by ſome in the Council, that the married Presbyters (ſuch as were married before made Presbyters) ſhould after their Ordination be ſeparated from their Wives, this *Paphnutius*, a Reverend Biſhop and a Confeſſor, though himſelf never married, oppoſed, ſaying, *Grave jugum, ——This was a heavy yoke, &c. and that perhaps ſuch a ſtrict* Cartw in ad. Reply, part. 1. p. 485.

rule of Continency could not be observed by all Clergy-mens wives. [But now mark what follows:] *That it was sufficient that those who had entred into the Clergy before they had married Wives* secundum veterem Ecclesiæ traditionem, *according to the Churches antient tradition, should afterward forbear from marrying: But yet that none ought to be separated from his wife that he had married before, when yet a Laick.* The story is in *Socrates*, l. 1. c. 8. & in *Zozomen*, l. 1. c. 22. Thus the Preacher gets not much advantage from *Paphnutius*.

13. Now for as much as concerns the Controversie touching *Marriage of Priests*, *Bellarmin* will grant, 'That the vow of Continence 'was annexed to Holy Orders onely by the 'Churches Decree: and consequently that it 'may be dispensed with. *Moreover* that the 'Roman Church in several Cases hath permit-'ted the Grecian Priests the use of their wives 'to whom they were married before their Or-'dination. And indeed, considering the temper of the *Eastern Countries*, far more enclin'd to such passions, than that of the *Europeans*, we find the *Eastern Churches* gave themselves far greater liberty than the *Western*. Yet no antient *Canon* of either of the Churches can be found that permitted *Priests* to contract Marriage after *Ordination*: And even among the *Grecians*, a cohabitation with their Wives was forbidden to Priests, who attended the Altar.

Bellarm. l. 1. de Cleric. cap. 18.

Ibid.

14. But what the universal belief and practise of the Western Churches was, our Preach-

er

er may collect from the following Teſtimonies. Therefore not to inſiſt upon the generally eſteem'd and reſolved unlawfulneſſe for *Biſhops* and *Prieſts* after their Ordination to contract *Matrimony*, (of a diſpenſation from which not one example can be given); It appears, that a Matrimonial uſe of wives to the formerly married, was forbidden, 1. By the *Second Council of Carthage*, expreſs in this Point: *It was agreed unto by all the Biſhops, that Biſhops, Prieſts, Deacons, and ſuch who diſpenſe Sacraments, ſhould be Obſervers of Chaſtity, and abſtain even from their own wives, that ſo what the Apoſtles taught, and Antiquity obſerved, we likewiſe may keep.* 2. The Second African Council thus decreed, *Whereas Relation was made of the Incontinence of certain Eccleſiaſtics, though with their own Wives, this Council thought good that, according to former Decrees, Biſhops, Prieſts and Deacons ſhould contain even from their Wives; which if they do not, let them be removed from their Eccleſiaſtical Office. As for other inferior Clarks, they are not compell'd hereto. But let every Church obſerve their own cuſtom.* 3. *Saint* Ambroſe witneſſeth the ſame, *You*, (ſays he) *who with pure bodies, uncorrupted modeſty, and being eſtranged even from Conjugal converſation, have received the grace of the holy Miniſtry, know well that we muſt exhibit the ſame Miniſtry without offence, without ſtain, neither muſt we ſuffer it to be violated with any Matrimonial Act. This I have not omitted to ſpeak, becauſe in certain remote places, ſome have procreated chil-*

2 Conc. Carthag. Can. 2.

Conc. African. cap. 37.

Ambr. l. 1. de Offic. c. 1. ult.

children, when they exercised Priesthood. And again, the Apostle speaking of a Bishop, sayes, *having children, not getting them.* 4. *Saint* Hierom writing against *Vigilantius*, sayes,

Hieron. lib. cont. Vigilant.

"What shall the Churches of the East do? "What shall the Churches of *Egypt* do? and "of the See Apostolick? all which receive "Clerks, either such as are Virgins or Conti- "nent, or if they have wives, such as cease to "be husbands to them. The like is said in the *Conclusion* of his book against *Iovinian.*

Id. Epist. ad Pamachius.

And he writes to *Pamachius* thus, *If married men like not this, let them not be angry with me, but with the holy Scriptures, with all Bishops, Priests and Deacons, who know they cannot offer Sacrifice, if they use the Act of marriage.* 5. *We are wont* (says Saint *Augustin*) *to propose to them the continence of Ecclesiasticks, who for the most part are compelled against their wills to undergo this burden, and yet having received it, they, by Gods assistance, beat it to their end.* I will conclude with the *Spanish Council* of *Eliberis*, more ancient then St. *Augustins* time, nay, ancienter then the *First General Council of* Nice, *The Council hath thought good, that it should be absolutely commanded to Bishops, Priests, Deacons, Sub-Deacons, to abstain from their Wives, and not to beget children.*

Aug. l. 2. de Adult. conjug. cap. 20.

Concil. Eliber. Can. 33.

15. That the *Eastern Churches* took to themselves anciently a greater liberty, is to be understood not generally; for in many of them as great a strictness was observed: as, besides the forecited testimony of S. *Hierom*, concern-

ing

ing the Churches of the *East* and of *Egypt*, appears from *Origen*, *Eusebius*, and *Epiphanius*, who all require continence in Priests, even from their wives, if they have any; And particularly, S. *Epiphanius* says, *That to do otherwise is not to observe the Canons, but to follow our natural inclinations, soon weary of such a burden.* And now the Doctor may do well to consider what a *Novelty* he has found out to entertain his Auditors with; especially, since all the forecited *Canons* and Practices (which are within the time of the *four first Councils*) were in force in *England* at the *Reformation*, as *England* was a Member of the *Western Patriarchat*, and therefore could not, without a transgression of all *Ecclesiastical Order*, be repealed by this single *National Church*: much less could this Church without a criminal, formal *Schism*, make such a generally received practice a pretence for separation.

Orig. hom. 23 in num. Euseb. de dem. Evang. lib. 1. cap. 8.

Eph. Hær. 59. & in fine operis.

16. His *Allegation* out of *Clemens* of *Alexandria*, that some of the Apostles had wives, is granted: But did they, after their executing their Office of Priesthood, lie with them? Did they leave any *young Apostles* behind them? As for the *Apostolick Canon* which *forbids Priests, &c. to cast off their Wives*: what would he infer from hence? Does he think married persons are husbands and wives only in the night? That which the *Canon* intended was, that *Ecclesiastical* persons should not make their Office a pretence to cast off the care of providing for their wives, or to be divorced from them: that is, such as were married, and had

wives

wives before they entred into Orders, who afterwards must not refuse conabitation with them, except when they officiate, unless with their wives consent, in the *Eastern Churches*. That the *Priests* under the *Law* were married, cannot be denied: since *Priesthood* necessarily descending by generation, marriage was therefore necessary. But sure he does not think such a carnal, umbratick *Priesthood*, is fit to be a *Pattern* for our *Christian Priesthood*, wholly spiritual, and withal *Elective*. Yet he may take notice, that even in that *Legal Priesthood*, at the times when they solemnly attended on the *Altar*, they had no *Matrimonial Commerce* with their wives: They came not reeking out of their beds into Gods Sanctuary, as may be gathered from 1 *Sam.* 2,4. and the prohibition in *Exod.* 19.15,22. *Be ready the third day, and come not at your wives*; On which place S. *Ambrose* discourses thus, *Filios susceperunt & id tanquam usu veteri defendunt*; There are Priests and Deacons in some secret places that defend their use of marriage by the Practice of old, when the duty of sacrificing had its interval of dayes. And yet then even the people were sanctified by abstaining from their wives two or three dayes before, and washed their garments, that they might approach pure unto the Sacrifice, *Si tanta in figura observantia quanta in veritate*, If the observation [of chastity] were so strict in the figure what ought it to be in the truth, *Disce sacerdos atque Levita quid sit lavare vestimenta tua ut mundum corpus celebrandis exhibeas Sacramentis.*

S. Ambr. Offic. l. 1. cap. 50. Zach. 7.3. 1 Cor. 7. 5.

17. To

17. To conclude, *Celibacy* to the Clergy being only injoyn'd by an *Ecclesiastical Law*, as being a thing at the least no way repugnant to the *Divine Law*, nay, much recommended therein; it is certainly lawful enough, though from the *beginning* it had been otherwise: For the *Church* hath liberty of making *Laws* concerning such things from time to time, as she sees fit, and her subjects are obliged to obey them.

CHAP. XVIII.

Of Divorce. The Practice of the Roman Church manifestly mistaken by the Preacher.

1. THe Doctors last *Novelty* is, *the Church of* Romes *allowing Liberty of Divorce betwixt man and wife, for many more causes then the cause of fornication, contrary*, sayes he, *to the Will of our blessed Saviour, revealed to us without a Parable, as if they meant nothing more then the opening a way to rebel against him.* A heavy charge: But for the *Legality* of it, he alledges in the *Margin* an expreſs Canon of the *Council of Trent*, which, whether he reads *à toto*, or *à toro*, sayes nothing at all to his purpose, proper *Divorce* being therein not so much Serm. Pag. 29.

much as thought of. And he himself saw and proved, it made nothing to his purpose, yet serv'd his turn, because *Chemnitius*, a malicious *Lutheran*, said falsely and ridiculously, *That the Papal separation from Bed and Board is in many ways a dissolution of the Conjugal Tie.* He would fain have *Maldonate* thought to speak on his side too, but it is apparently otherwise.

2. Truly this is a *Quarrel* so properly *a l'Alamand*, that one would think the *Doctor* took only an occasion thereby to let the Court see his *critical* diligence in observing the false and true *Impressions* of the *Canons* of the *Council* of *Trent*, in some of which he has read [*e toto*] which makes no sence: and in others [*a toto*] which only could be the *Councils* expression. But we hope an undiligent *Printer* (who for all that may be a good *Roman Catholic*) shall not make the *Roman Church* it self *causally Schismatical*, and thereby excuse the *Preachers* separation.

3. It is pitty to lose time about such a trifle, which, I think, never before this *Sermon*, was by any English Protestant reckon'd among the pretended *Criminal Novelties* of the *Roman Church*. (Yet I may be mistaken, for there are a world of Sermons and Treatises, like his, in intrinsic value, which never had the fortune to be made so current.) However, left he should be angry if so material a part of his *Sermon* be neglected, a little pains shall not break squares between us.

4. He may therefore take notice, that in the

the buſineſſe of *Marriage* there are, among Catholic Writers, diſtinguiſh'd *four* ſorts of *Separations*: 1. *A Jewiſh Divorce*, which in Latin we ſeldom call *Divortium*, but *Repudium*. 2. *A Chriſtian Divorce*, properly ſo called. 3. *A Separation a toro*. 4. *A Separation* both *a toro & cohabitatione*.

5 Touching the *firſt*, if we have regard to *the direct intention of God* and his Servant *Moſes*, it was no other, nor ought to have been put in practiſe upon other grounds then the *Chriſtian Divorce*, allow'd by our *Saviour*, that is, for *Fornication only*. But by the *permiſſion* in the Old Law, there might follow that *Divorce*, a *ſecond Marriage* by either of the parties, whether innocent or guilty: Yet not upon every cauſe as the *Jews* practiſed it, but beſides *Adultery*, only *propter turpitudinem*, for ſome notorious uncleanneſſe extreamly diſtaſtful. Now, notwithſtanding ſuch *permiſſion*, which was meerly *for the hardneſs of Jewiſh hearts*, their Divorce for any other cauſe, and eſpecially their ſecond *Marriage* after it, was not excuſed from ſin, but only from a legal puniſhment: And the principal motive was, leſt worſe effects, as poyſoning, or any other way of murdering, &c. ſhould be practiſed by the diſcontented party, in caſe a total ſeparation might not be permitted. This *Supremeſt Degree* of Jewiſh Separation (or *Repudium*) does not intirely diſſolve the *Matrimonial Contract*, which being conſummate of its own nature is indiſſoluble; for the parties, being by Matrimony become *One fleſh*, and one Principle of a new ſtock, cannot by any Deut. 24.

any *following* act or accident, but only *Death*, become two again, so as to be in the same capacity as they were before they were married. And for this reason the *Jews*, though permitted to marry afterward, yet sinned in so doing against the primary Precept of God. *Those whom God hath joyned, let no man separate.*

6. Much lesse does the *second species of Separation*, or the proper *Christian Divorce* dissolve this tye. The only lawful cause of which *Separation* is by our *Savior* allow'd, and by the *Catholic Church* acknowledged to be *Fornication*, (that is indeed, *Adultery*:) under which are likewise comprehended, as our most learned Doctors say, other more grievous sins of *unnatural Lusts*. And the reason why only such sins may (not must) cause such a perpetual separation is, because they alone are directly contrary to *Conjugal Faith*. By this separation, whensoever it is caused by the crime of the one party, neither of them, (not the innocent party) are permitted to betake themselves to a second Marriage: for then they could not be reconciled but by a new *Marriage*. And here the *Preacher* may do well to consider what a *Patron* he has betaken himself to, which is *Chemnitius*, who, against our *Saviours Law* (as all Antiquity, and the practice of the *English Reform'd Church* interpret it) contendes for the lawful Marriage of the innocent party, to teaching formal *Adultery*. This separation (for such a legal cause is perpetual, that is, the innocent persons may deprive the others of the right they have over their bodies, and are in

in a free condition even after the faulty persons repentance, whether or no to receive them again into their former condition: Neither can it be imputed to the innocent person, if the criminal should by such a separation fall into the sin of adultery.

7. The other two *Separations* (not *Divorces*) one whereof is only [*à toro*] from the *Bed*, the other from *Cohabitation* also, may be made for other causes, besides *fornication*. As for som very infectious diseases, for almost irreconcileable quarrels, for attempts of killing or wounding one another, &c. Such Separations are not so perpetual as *Divorces*, each of the parties being bound, assoon as these impediments of conjugal conversation are removed, to return, as before, to a *Matrimonial Amity* and *Correspondence*; And till then, I would ask the *Doctor*, whether he have the courage to admit into his Bed, or even his house, a Serpent not only full of venom, but ready and attempting to kill him with it? Or if he have not this courage, whether he will acknowledg such a separation so necessary, even to the preservation of life, to be a *Divorce* damnable, because not for *fornication*? What he will answer, I know not; But what he must, if he go about to maintain his Assertion, I am certain will be very irrational.

8. Let him reflect on the practise of his own Church, where he cannot but have heard of the common distinction of Divorces *A Vinculo Matrimonii*, & *à mensa & toro*: these two are both allow'd in *England*: now I ask the Doctor, of which does our Saviour speak? If he say

say of the first, then clearly the Husband of an Adultresse may marry again; which is contrary to the Law: if he say of the second, still he contradicts his own Law, which every day allows a separation for other Causes, besides that of Fornication. Can we believe the Doctor never read the ordinary Cases wherein Divorses are granted, as *Pre-contract, Fear, Frigidity, Consanguinity?* &c. all which dissolve the very Marriage it self, and yet in all these the Marriage was valid, till actual divorce, and the children shall bear the Fathers name, and inherit his lands, if there never happen an actual divorce; this the wise men of our Nation do, and never think they *open a way to rebel against Christ.* Something like this, for the second branch of the distinction, *St. Paul* himself does, and sure he cannot be *opposite to the will of our Saviour; If,* says he, *the Unbeliever depart, let him depart, a Brother or a Sister is not subject in such cases,* that is, the Innocent may remain separate: and why may not the laws of a Nation regulate that liberty, which the Apostle allows to every private Person? or why may not a General Council determin such points as well as the laws of a particular Nation? Thus I conceive it clear'd, that You and We are in this particular either Both innocent, or Both guilty.

Pag. 29.

1 Cor. 7.

CHAP.

CHAP. XIX.

Of SCHISM. *The unpardonableneſs of that Crime, acknowledged by Antiquity*, &c. *No cauſe or pretence can excuſe it.*

1. HAving followed the *Doctor* through all his vainly pretended *Novelties of Doctrine*: We are at laſt arrived to the moſt *concerning* Point of all, *Schiſm*: Moſt *concerning* certainly; for there is not any one of the fore-mentioned *Doctrines*, which in themſelves conſidered, would abſolutely deſtroy Souls, though they erred about them; But *Schiſm* alone, whatſoever Error of Doctrine, yea though no Error of Doctrine, were either indeed, or pretended to be a cauſe of it, will be inevitably *damning* to every Soul guilty of it; which damnation neither rectitude of Faith, nor any good Works, nor even *Martyrdom* it ſelf will be

Aug. de Symb. ad Catech. l. 4. c. 10.

able to prevent. *For this cause,* (ſayes St. *Auguſtine*) *our Chriſtian Creed concludes with the Articles touching the Church, becauſe if any one be found ſeparated from her, he ſhall be excluded out of the number of God's Children: neither ſhall he have God for his Father, who will not have the Church for his Mother. It will nothing profit ſuch an one that he hath been Orthodox in belief, done ſo many good works,* &c.

2. This is a *Truth* generally teſtified by the ancient *Doctors* of God's Church, and not at all queſtioned by the more ſober Writers of the *Engliſh Church* who have written of *Schiſm*, &c. They all are ready, in words at leaſt, to ſay with St. *Denys* of Alexandria, *That we ought rather to endure any torments, then conſent to the diviſion of God's Church, ſince the Martyrdom to which we expoſe our ſelves by hindring a diviſion of the Church, is no leſs glorious, then that which is ſuffer'd for refuſing to ſacrifice to Idols.* And with St. *Pacian*, *Though* (the *Schiſmatick*) Novatian *hath been put to death* (for the Faith) *yet he hath not been crown'd: Why not crown'd? Becauſe he dy'd out of the peace, concord and Communion of the Church, ſeparated from that common Mother, of whom, who ever will be a Martyr muſt be a Member.* And with St. *Irenæus*, *There cannot poſsibly be made any Reformation of ſuch importance, as the miſchief of Schiſm is pernicious,* &c.

Euſeb. Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 6.

Pacian ad Sympr. Epiſt. 2.

Iren. l. 4. c. 62.

3. But

3. But I do not find that *Proteſtant Doctors* have endeavour'd to penetrate into the true grounds, why, above almoſt all other ſins a Chriſtian is capable of committing, *Schiſm*, that is the *ſetting up an Altar againſt an Altar*, or the relinquiſhing the *external Communion* of the *Church*, the making *Colletts* or Aſſemblies without, yea againſt the conſent of Biſhops or Church Governours, *&c.* ſhould be a ſin ſo unpardonable, that no ignorance (unleſs ſuppoſed ſuch as is invincible; which I fear much fewer then is ordinarily imagined, of thoſe, who have any liberal Education can pretend to, in that great evidence and light which they have of the continued ſucceſſion, unity of Doctrine, perfect obedience to their ſpiritual Superiours, penances, and retirements from the world, and ſeveral other ſignal marks of the One, Holy, Catholick, Apoſtolick Church) no ignorance, I ſay, no ſurreption, provocation, *&c.* can excuſe it. Some may be more deeply guilty, and obnoxious to a heavier damnation then others, as *Ring-leaders* more then *followers*; but *damnation* is by the *Fathers* generally denounced as the portion of all.

4. The true *Reaſon* whereof may be deduced from the example of all other *Governments* whatſoever. The greateſt offence a Subject can commit againſt *Mo-*

narchy, is an actual attempt, or rather the attempt executed, by which *Monarchy* is dissolved: Inwardly to condemn the *Laws of such a Government*, to entertain *Principles*, which if put in practise, would withdraw Subjects from their due Obedience, is an offence of an high nature, but the actual *cantoning* of a *Kingdom*, and the raising in it *Courts*, *or Judicatories* independent on, and opposite to the *Common Tribunal* of the Country, is the utmost of all crimes: both the *Seducers* and *Seduced* are not only deprived of the priviledges belonging to good Subjects, but pursued by Arms as the worst of all *enemies*.

5. It is so in *God's Church*; The main thing our *Creed* teaches us to believe of it, is its *unity*, without which it is not a Church: Now if *Unity*, then *Order*, then *Subordination* of *Governours*, &c. what therefore is *the great sin* against this fundamental constitution of the Church, but *Schism*? a dissolving the Communion and connexion that the members of this great Body have among themselves, and with relation to the whole? We all willingly acknowledge, that the great sin of the *Synagogue*, the sin that fill'd up the measure of the crimes of the *Jews*, was their murdering *our Lord*. Now sayes St. *Chrysostom*, *We shall not merit and incur a less cruel punishment, if we divide the unity and plenitude*

Chrysost. ad Eph. hom. 11.

of the Church (the myſtical Body of our Lord) *then thoſe have done which pierced, mangled and tore his own Body.* And the very like expreſſion hath St. *Cyprian.* Cypr. de unit. Eccleſ.

6. There are very few *Hereſies* (that is, only ſuch *Errors* as are formally deſtructive to thoſe very few verities or *Articles* of *Faith*, without an explicite belief whereof no man can be ſaved) which do in themſelves, ſimply, as falſe opinions, univerſally deſtroy Salvation: Indeed, if they have the *formality of Hereſie* joyned to them, and be maintained with a knowledge that they are contrary to the ſence and authority of the *Church*, then they have involved in them ſomething of *Schiſm*, or at leaſt they are in an immediate diſpoſition to *Schiſm*, and in that regard all *Hereſies*, though in Points of themſelves leſs important, are damnative. But *Schiſm* alone, though there be no *Hereſie* joyned with it, immediately divides from the *Body* of *Chriſt*, and conſequently from *Chriſt* himſelf.

7. But may not *ignorance* excuſe the guilt of *Schiſm*? No: on the contrary in ſome regard it aggravates it. For though *Pride* and *Malice* be far greater in the *Leading Schiſmaticks*, perſons of wit and learning: yet *ignorant ſouls* and ideots ſeem more to contradict human reaſon; becauſe the

more ignorant they ought to know they are, and being confessedly no *Pastors*, the more ought they to submit their judgments to Authority, and consequently the preferring their own conduct; or the conduct and direction of particular men or Churches, before the *universal Authority* of the Church, the excommunicating (as it were) the whole Church of God, the esteeming all Christians, both *Pastors* and *Flocks*, *as Heathens and Publicans*, is a presumption so contrary to human nature and reason, that their want of learning is that which will most condemn them. I speak not now of persons absolutely *idem*, who scarce know there are any other *Pastors*, or any other *Church* then their own, who pretend not at all to pass their judgements on other Religions, but know only what their *Pastors* teach them, having no ability, by reason of their condition, to examine *Scriptures* and Churches: For such no doubt, may by their simplicity and absolute invincible ignorance, escape the malignity of *Schism*. But I speak of inferiour Tradesmen, of Gentlemen and Gentlewomen, who have a capacity of being rightly instructed, and better informed of that spiritual authority to which they owe their subjection, and yet who, by their own perverseness, become troublers of the *Church*, and who, because they ca-

read

read the *Scriptures*, take upon them to judge of the ſence of them, both for themſelves and their *Paſtors*, &c. Such as theſe no doubt have drunk in the very gall of *Schiſm*, by uſurping an authority, which expreſs Scripture ſayes belongs only to *Paſtors*.

8. Some learned perſons (particularly *Doctor Steward*) attribute much to the temper of the *Engliſh Church*, which he ſayes is like St. *Cyprians*, *Neminem condemnantes, aut à communione ſeparantes*: and this alone they ſuppoſe will exempt *Proteſtants* (as it did St. *Cyprian*) from the imputation and penalty of *Schiſm*, to which other violent *Calviniſtical Congregations* are more obnoxious. But the caſe is not the ſame: This indeed did exempt St. *Cyprian*, becauſe as St. *Auguſtin* ſayes, the Church had not then decided the diſpute, to whoſe deciſion St. *Cyprian* would certainly have ſubmitted. The caſe of Proteſtants is evidently different. If a *Province* in *England* had withdrawn it ſelf from the publick civil authority, would this excuſe ſerve them to ſay, 'We do 'not intend to quarrel with thoſe that conti-'nue in obedience to the King, we mean nei-'ther him nor them any harm, they ſhall be 'welcom to come among us, if they will, we 'will be good friends, we will not meddle with 'their doings: But we will be govern'd only

by our own Laws and Magistrates, &c? I believe not: Their civility in their rebellion, will not change the Title of their crime, nor free them from the *punishment due to it*: it may perhaps qualifie the *Princes* resentment; but the *civillest Treason* is *Treason*.

9. Being to examine the *Doctor's Plea*, touching the Point of *Schism*, I thought requisite to premise this consideration of its heynousness, that both he and my self also, should consider it as the most important of all other, in which the least mistake will prove mortal. I will add a bold word, and undertake to justifie it: Though it were far more probable that the *Catholick Church* had been guilty of *Innovation* in all the Points mentioned by the *Doctor*: yet since by the *Protestants* confession those *Points* are not *fundamental*, their voluntary separating themselves from her Communion, will be in God's esteem very *Schism*.

CHAP.

CHAP. XX.

How the Preacher vainly endeavours to excuſe his Church from Schiſm. *Of the Subordination of Church Governors and Synods. The breach of their Subordination, is the cauſe of all diſ-unions and Schiſms. The unappealable Authority of general Councils, acknowledged by Antiquity.*

1. IN this point of *Schiſm*, to the end the *Doctor* may clear *Proteſtants*, and lay the weight of ſo great a crime on the Catholick Church, he argues thus, *Since beſides corruptions in practice (which yet alone cannot juſtify ſeparation) there were in the Roman Church ſo many corruptions in Doctrine*

Urine likewiſe intrenching on Fundamentals, the Schiſm could not be on the Chruch of Englands ſide, which was obliged to ſeparate, ſo juſt a cauſe being given, but on theirs, who gave the cauſe of the ſeparation? Now, that particular Nations have a power to purge themſelues from corruptions without leave from the See of Rome, *appears* 1. *By the conceſſion of the moſt learned Popiſh Writers.* 2. *From the ancient practiſe of the Kings of England, who were* αυτοκράτορες. 3. *Likewiſe from the Codes and Novels of* Juſtinian, *the capitulare of Charlemagne, and the endeavours of two late Emperours.* 4. *From the examples of the Kings of* Juda. He concludes, *that had the Pope been content with his Primacy of Order, they would never have caſt off the yoke, which never had been put upon their necks; whence appears, ſayes he, that the Uſurper made the Schiſm.* This is the ſubſtance of his *Diſcourſe.*

2. In anſwering this, I will proceed according to this method. 1. I will ſhew out of Antiquity, from the example of all orderly Governments, from evident reaſon, &c. what *obedience* every Chriſtian is obliged to perform to *Church Governors*, in the obſtinate refuſal of which, conſiſts *Schiſm.* 2. I will apply this to the preſent controverſie, between the *Engliſh* and *Roman Church.* I will conſider the validity of his allegations, and leave it to

any

any indifferent mans conſcience to judge whether they are ſufficient to juſtifie the *ſeparation*.

3. Touching the *firſt Point*, I take it for granted, that we both agree that our Lord has placed in his Church, *Eccleſiaſtical Governours*, to continue by a legitimate ſucceſſion, to the end of the world: And that the exerciſe of their *Authority*, conſiſts partly in propoſing *Doctrines* to be believed, partly in making Laws for *Diſcipline* and *Order*. And that the Doctrines are to be no other, then ſuch as either are expreſly, or at leaſt, in their immediate neceſſary *Principles*, contained in *Divine Revelation*: no innovation, no change muſt be in them; whereas orders for *Diſcipline* may, according to the prudence of the Church, ſometimes admit alteration. Likewiſe I believe, we agree that this lawful Authority of *Church Governours*, or *Biſhops*, may be differently exerciſed, that is, either by their ſingle perſons, or in conjunction with others, meeting in *Synods Dioceſan, Provincial, National, Patriarkical, and Oecumenical*: The Authority of which *Synods*, is by degrees reſpectively encreaſed, according to the quality of them; the loweſt degree among theſe, being *Dioceſan*, and the *Supream* unappealable authority being in *Oecumenical Synods*. To deny this in groſs, is to make them ridi-

ridiculous *Conventicles*; and the more *plenary* they are, the more dangerous and deſtructive of *unity* will they be, if they may be repealed by others leſs *plenary*.

4. Thus far we agree; but when we come to a preciſe declaration of the quality of that Authority, by both ſides agreed on in the general, here we begin to differ; wherefore to the end, indifferent *Readers* may be enabled diſtinctly, to view and judge on which ſide Juſtice and Truth lies; I will, beſides what has already been ſaid of *infallibility*, plainly ſet down the *Catholick Doctrine* concerning this matter, with the exceptions, which the moſt learned Controvertiſts of the *Engliſh Church* have interpoſed againſt it.

Clem. Conſtit. l. 6. cap. 14.

5. There is in St. *Clement's Conſtitutions*, a ſaying, that *to every Biſhop is entruſted* [ὁ καθόλου ἐπισκοπὴ] *the Epiſcopal Office Univerſally*. In like manner St. *Cyprian* ſays, [*Epiſcopatus unus eſt, cujus a ſingulis in ſolidum pars tenetur*] *The Epiſcopal Office is but one, of which every Biſhop holds his portion in common*. The meaning of which ſpeeches is not, that every particular *Biſhop* is, in regard of his Juriſdiction, an *Oecumenical Biſhop*: But ſince the Church in general is truly and perfectly *one Body*, each *Biſhop* in it is ſo to adminiſter his Charge, as that he muſt have an eye to the whole.

Cypr. l. de unit. Eccleſ.

Dioceſes

Dioceſes and *Provinces*, *&c.* are not to be eſteem'd as ſo many *Secular Principalities* independent and abſolute, which can publiſh *Declarations* and *Laws* without any regard to their *Neighbours* profit, or liking: It is not ſo in the *Church*; But every *Biſhop*, in executing his *Epiſcopal Office*, ought much more to be ſollicitous of the general *Unity*, Peace, and Edification of the *whole Church*, than of his own *Dioceſe*: So that if any *Law*, Cuſtom, or Doctrine in it be diſcordant from, but eſpecially if it condemn what is by *Law* in force in *the Province*, *Patriarchat*, or much more the *Univerſal Church*, ſuch a *Law* ought not to be made, or being made, ought to be Repealed.

6. As for the *Authority* of *Biſhops in Synods*, particularly in declaring *Doctrines*, (for in that we are at preſent principally concern'd) Such Authority may be conceived to extend it ſelf either to the *not-out-ward-contra-Profeſſion* only, or to the *inward aſſent*, *&c.* Between which two there is a great difference.

7. The common received *Catholick Doctrine* teacheth, that whereas in *General Councils* (the only Tribunal which is by all acknowledg'd to be infallible) there may be either, 1. A *Declaration* of *Traditionary Doctrines*, which formerly before ſuch *Declaration* did not evidently and univer-

niverſally appear to be *Traditionary*: 2. Or a *Deciſion* of *Debates* about clear and immediate *Conſequences* of ſuch *Doctrines*. In both theſe the *Church* is *infallible*, Infallible I ſay (not to enlarge Diſputes beyond the preſent exigence) at leaſt in all points any way neceſſary to our Salvation; and this grounded upon thoſe ſure Promiſes of our Lord made to theſe Guides of his Church mentioned before, *Cap.* 9. 11, 12. And hence ſuch both *Declarations* and *Deciſions* are to be not only not contradicted, but ſubmitted to by an internal aſſent; the undiſcover'd refuſal of which aſſent, though it doth not render the refuſers *Hereticks* in the judgement of the *Church*, as upon contradiction or refuſal of aſſent would (for *Eccleſia non judicat de internis:*) Yet ſince ſuch *Declarations* and *Deciſions* are alwayes attended either with expreſs, or at leaſt imply'd *Anathemas* to contrary Doctrines, the contrary internal Judgments are *Heretical*.

8. Of the acknowledged *Infallibility* of the Repreſentative Church in *Declarations* of *Traditionary Doctrines*, we have ſufficient Teſtimonies from *Antiquity*. St. *Athanaſius*, quoted alſo by St. *Epiphanius*, profeſſes, That *he wonders how any one dares move a queſtion touching matters defined in the* Nicen Council, *ſince, the Decrees*

Athan. Ep. ad Epict.
Epiph. Hær. 77.

crees of ſuch Councils cannot be changed without errour; Therefore they are unalterable, and in our ſenſe *infallible*. Nor can there be any doubt, but thoſe *matters defin'd*, were Ancient and Traditionary Doctrines. And St. *Auguſtin* ſayes, *The laſt Judgment of the Church is a General Council*. The ſame holy *Father*, treating of *Rebaptization* formerly held by St. *Cyprian*, and after by the *Donatiſts*, ſays, *That for that Doctrine* (which was truly Traditionary) *the Donatiſts were Heretick's, but St. Cyprian not: Why?* Becauſe it was *permitted to the former Fathers and Biſhops to debate, and, without breaking Communion, to determine oppoſitly to one another in Provincial Councils: Till in a General Council, the true Orthodox Doctrine were without all further doubts confirmed. Which Authority* (ſays he) *St. Cyprian, if it had been declared in his time, would without any doubt at all have believed.*

Aug. Epiſt. 162. id. lib. 4. de Trin.

Id, lib. 1. de Bapt. cont. Donat. l. 1. c. 7.

Ibid. l. 2. c. 4.

9. In the next place, as touching *Deciſions* of *Controverſies* about (not expreſly *Traditionary Doctrines*, but) clear and immediate conſequences of ſuch *Doctrines*, it is abſolutely neceſſary oft-times, for the Church to make ſuch *Deciſions*; for otherwiſe the *Devil* would have power to undermine a great part of our *Faith*, if permiſſion were given to maintain freely, any thing that does not appear to any one

one expreſly, either in *Scripture* or in *Tradition*. Thus, many of the *Articles* of the *Nicen*, *Conſtantinopolitan*, and *Athanaſian Creeds*, are only the clear and immediate Conſequences of expreſs *Traditions*, which *Articles*, in the *Terms* wherein they were there conceived, were not abſolutely neceſſary to be believed, before the ariſing of *Hereſies*, forced the Church further to explain the *Faith*. And hence it is, that the Enlargements and clearer Explanations of our *Faith*, in many *Doctrines*, otherwiſe not neceſſary to be ſo generally known, muſt and will encreaſe to the worlds end, in caſe *New Hereſies* ariſe.

10. Now ſuch *Deciſions* are truly *de fide*, or objects of our *Faith*: For though it be moſt certain, that the *Church* neither hath, nor pretends to have any *New Revelations*; of Chriſtian verities, but the ſame *Faith* which was delivered by the *Apoſtles*, is ſtill the *Faith* of the *Church*, and no more: There are no Additions made, no *new Articles* invented: Notwithſtanding the ſame *Articles*, by occaſion of *Hereſies* ariſing, may in ſucceeding times be further explained, and the *Truths* implicitely involved in them may be diſcovered.

In like manner, ſome *Traditionary points* convey'd by the general practice of the Church,

Church, when they come to be queſtion'd or denyed by *Hereticks*, are often explicitely declared in *Councils* to be *Traditions*, by which Declaration, there is no new thing taught, but that which was formerly involved, is more clearly manifeſted, and that which was taught by practice is declared by words, and that which was known to the learneder part of Chriſtians, becomes extended to all: Thus the *Doctrine* of *Purgatory*, *Prayer for the Dead*, *Invocation of Saints*, &c. have been in later *Councils* made *Articles*, not *de novo*, (as the *Doctor* miſapprehends) but they are lately teſtified to have been ſo anciently believed; and ſo are all other new deciſions of later Councils, Points of ancient Faith, either in themſelves explicitely, or in their neceſſary principles implicitely. And if, after ſuch deciſions of Councils, there ariſeth a new obligation, that none can diſſent from them without incurring the guilt of Diſobedience, ſo was there before an obligation of non-diſſenting from the ſame Points without falling into Error; and that in a matter of Divine Revelation. Such Points were alwayes matter of faith, if we would believe, in thoſe particulars, what was Divine Truth; though now indeed more neceſſary matter of our faith, out of the obedience alſo and ſubmiſſion that we owe to the

Church's judgement; to which judgement we could have no obligation, before ſhe declared it. Neither can this be avoided when ever the Church is by new riſen Errors neceſſitated to ſtate or declare ſuch a Divine Truth, but that ſuch a new obligation will ariſe to Chriſtians, in relation to Her, of believing it; elſe to what end does ſhe ſtate it? Which obligation is alſo a reſtraint of our former liberty indeed, whereby we might then believe an error in divine matters, without the guilt of diſobeying the Church; but this reſtraint is much for our benefit in our knowing and holding ſome truth now, which perhaps we did not formerly, and that in a time, when we are in more danger, from Seducers, of falling into the contrary Error. And now behold, theſe neceſſary deciſions are called the Church's new Articles of Faith; this is her chief accuſation; and the ſame clamour now raiſed by the Preacher againſt the Council of *Trent* for this matter, as was anciently *by the Arians* againſt the firſt General Council, who cryed out againſt the new Article and word *Conſubſtantiality*, which was not found in their former Creed; as was anciently *by the Neſtorians* againſt the third General Council, and *by the Eutychians* againſt the fourth. And therefore, why may not the Council of *Trent*, for its defence,

fence, return the ſame anſwer to the Preacher, as the fourth General Council, which he profeſſeth to allow, did to the *Eutychians*? ‖ ----- *A not-much-diſcuſſed explication of the faith is ſufficient* (ſay they) *for the benefit of ſincere Believers. But for thoſe who endeavour to pervert the true Doctrine, 'tis neceſſary to make oppoſition to all thoſe things which they erroneouſly broach, and to provide fit remedies to their objections. For if all would willingly acquieſce to the eſtabliſhment of the* [Nicene] *Faith, and would diſturb this clear way of Piety with no innovation, it were meet, for the poſterity of the Church, to excogitate* [in their Councils] *no new additions. But becauſe there are many that decline from this right line, through the crooked paths of error, we are conſtrained with new diſcovery of truth to reduce them, and to refute their ſtraying opinions with wholſom additions* [i. e. to the former Doctrines of the Church.] *Not, as if we were ever ſeeking out ſome new thing tending to Godlineſs, as though the former faith were defective, but that we may ſeek out thoſe things which are judged ſalutary and beneficial in oppoſition to thoſe things which are innovated by them.* Thus that Council, whoſe words clearly demonſtrate, that Councils may define, not only traditionals in matters of Faith, but any new concluſions which are neceſſarily and evidently deri-

‖ Concluſ. of the *Synod* ad Marcianum Imperat.

vative from them. And here let the equal Reader judge, whether the Doctor hath more reaſon to complain of the Councils new Articles, or the Council of his, and his Predeceſſors new Errors. Out of which evil yet, the wiſdom of God, in the ſeveral ages, brings this good (as *Evagrius* ‖ accutely obſerves to the Pagans, ſcandalized at the diviſions and novelties of opinions that aroſe amongſt Chriſtians) that by occaſions of Hereſies *the Orthodox dogmes are more accurately poliſhed, and more entirely compiled, and that by this means the Church every day increaſeth in knowledge*: i. e. by having the explicite Articles of her Faith more and more enlarged. As we ſee how much even in early times the *Athanaſian* Creed (by the ſpringing up of ſeveral Hereſies in thoſe days) had enlarged the *Apoſtolick*.

‖ Hiſt. 1. lib. 11. c.

11. All theſe Declarations and Deciſions framed by General Councils, we *Roman Catholicks* do eſteem our ſelves obliged to the aſſent unto, which is far more then not to contradict. And this obligation is founded on the *Infallible Authority* which we acknowledge in the *Catholick Church*, derived from the promiſes of *Chriſt*, *whoſe Spirit ſhall lead her into all Truth*: The denial of which aſſent we affirm to be *formal Hereſie*: and an open contradiction to which Authority, is *formal Schiſm*.

12. This

12. This we are taught concerning our *Duty* and Submiſſion to *General Councils*. And hereto we muſt add, that conſidering the preſent diſtracted ſtate of the *Chriſtian world*, and eſpecially the Schiſm pertinaciouſly perſiſted in by the Eaſtern Patriarks, who live under the Tyranny of the Turk, and therefore will never probably be permitted to convene for the general Union of Chriſtendom, it is almoſt become impoſſible that ſuch *General Councils* ſhould now be aſſembled with all formalities, as the *four firſt* were, wherein all the *five Patriarks* were preſent, at leaſt by their *Deputies*. Yet, notwithſtanding all this, we cannot without infidelity doubt that *God* will be wanting to his *Church* to preſerve it in *Truth* and *Unity*. Since therefore ſuch an *Oecumenical Council* cannot be expected, as was during the times of the *Roman Empire*, the Supremeſt that can now be had, ought to have the force and vertue of obliging, which the former ones had; the *Anathemas* of it muſt be as valid; the *Deciſions* of it as much to be ſubmitted to, and a renunciation of its *Doctrine* and *Laws* as heynouſly *Schiſmatical*, as of any *Council* that ever went before: Therefore *Doctor Bramhal*, *Lord Primate of Armagh*, in the *Preface of his Reply* to the Biſhop of *Chalcedon*, declaring that he ſubmits himſelf to the Repre-

ſentative Church, that is, to *a free General Council*, moſt rationally adds this clauſe, or *to ſo General, as can be procured.*

13. Thus of *General Councils*. As for inferior ſubordinate *Councils*, though their *Decrees* touching *Doctrines* and *Laws* for *Diſcipline* are not unappealable, yet an obligation, in both theſe reſpects, they impoſe on *Chriſtians* living reſpectively within their Precincts. The *Deciſions* of a *Provincial Synod* are to be internally aſſented to, except they be evidently erroneous, or contradictory to thoſe of a *Superior Synod*, ſo that without *Schiſm* they cannot be openly contradicted. Yet the ſame *Deciſions* may be annulled by a *Patriarchical Synod*: And all by an *Oecumenical*, of which alone all the *Deciſions* and Laws are *irreverſible*, becauſe there is no Authority upon earth ſuperior to it, and in all *Governments* an inferior Authority can never reverſe what hath once been eſtabliſhed by a Superior, eſpecially if that eſtabliſhment hath been actually ſubmitted to: For, if a *Provincial Synod* could annul the formerly received *Acts* of a *National*, or a *National* of a *Patriarchical*, there muſt of neceſſity follow a Diſſolution of all Government and *Unity*, as to the whole Catholick Church, yet we profeſs in our Creed, *Unam Catholicam*----- Add to this, that in all *Synods* the *Major part* alwayes muſt decide: ſo that

that the fewer, however they may be eſteem'd the better or more learned, muſt ſubmit to them: Theſe likewiſe all uſe of meetings and conſultations will be evacuated.

14. This *fundamental Rule of all Government and Unity* is the only true, unerring *Touch-ſtone*, by which a judgement is to be made concerning *Schiſm*; If *Doctor Pierce* can furniſh us with a better, let it be produced: but that being impoſſible, he muſt give us leave to make uſe of this to examin the cauſe between the *Roman Catholick Church*, and all other Congregations that call themſelves *Reformed*. But indeed it is loſt labour to apply ſuch a *Rule* as this to any *Calviniſtical*, *Independent*, or *Fanatick Congregations*, becauſe they renounce both all ſuch *Laws*, and the whole *Authority* and *Offices* of thoſe that made them: Therefore (leaving them to the ſevere judgement of him who ſaid, *Where are thoſe my enemies that will not have me to rule over them?*) I will conſider the *Controverſie*, as the *Preacher* ſtated it, between the *Roman Catholick* and *Engliſh Proteſtant Churches*, I ſay [*as he hath ſtated it*] becauſe being to treat of *Schiſm*, he hath given the right notion of it, and not miſpent time and paper, as ſome others have done, with vain diſcourſes of an *Internal* and *External ſeparation*, Luke 19.

&c. as if there were no danger in external *Schism* or dividing of Communion, unless men also have, with the *Presbyterians*, &c. lost all even appearance of charity to all Christian Churches before them, damning all who believe that *Article* of our *Creed* concerning the Unity and *Authority of the Church.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXI.

The Fundamental RULE *of Church-Government. Limitations of the Authority of Gen Councils. Their Grounds made by Arch Biſhop* Lawd, *Dr.* Feild, *&c. Of Points Fundamental, and Non-fundamental. Proteſtants allow not ſo much Authority to Gen. Councils, as God commanded to be given the Jewiſh* Sanedrim. *Of the pretended Independence of the Engliſh Church, from the Example of* Cyprus.

The foreſaid *fundamental Rule* of all Government, *That no Laws can validly be repealed by an Authority Inferior to that, by which*

which they were Enacted, is a Rule not now invented to serve our present purpose, but written in the hearts of all mankind, that consider what Government is; and it is, as to *Church-matters*, particularly taken notice of by St. *Augustine*, when he declares the Order that is in the Church, and which alone can keep it in unity; *Particular Writings of Bishops*, saies he, *if any Error be in them, may be corrected by others more learned, or by Synods; and Synods themselves assembled either in Provinces, or Regions ought without any tergiversation to yield and submit to the Authority of Plenary Councils; and oftimes former Plenary Councils, may be corrected by other following Plenary Councils.*

Aug. de Bapt. cont. Donat. l. 2, c. 3.

2. This most Irrefragable *Rule*, is that by which *Schism* may most certainly, and undeniably be discovered. And therefore though in gross it be admitted by *Protestants*, (I mean the wisest and most learned among them) yet out of a necessity of maintaining the grounds of the *English Reformation*, they put such restrictions & exceptions to it, as utterly take away all use of it. For whereas S. *Augustine* makes the *Supream Authority* of the *Church*, to reside in *plenary* or *general Councils*, because he *withal* implies, that such *Councils may be corrected*, they therefore take the *liberty* to reject them, at least in *decisions* in their esteem of less

leſs importance, and by that means altogether inervate their Authority: Not conſidering that in caſe the *Deciſions*, which he ſaies, may be mended, ſhould regard matters of *belief*, which perhaps, upon better conſideration, may be expreſſed more commodiouſly, and ſo, as that they may be leſs liable to miſconſtruction; yet it belongs not to any particular men or Churches to correct them, but onely to ſucceeding Councils of equal Authority. To demonſtrate this, I will here ſet down what Authority learned *Proteſtants*, ſuch as *Doctor Field*, the late *Arch-Biſhop Lawd*, &c. acknowledg in general Councils, and withal, how they circumſcribe the ſame Authority.

3. Theſe agree, that the Univerſal Church is infallible in fundamentals: Hence ſays the Archbiſhop, *The viſible Church hath in all ages taught that unchanged faith of Chriſt in all Points fundamental:* Doctor White *had reaſon to ſay this*, &c. Again, *The whole* Church *cannot univerſally erre in abſolutely fundamental Doctrines, therefore it is true alſo that there can be no juſt cauſe of making a Schiſm from the whole* Church. Again, quoting *Kickerman*, he ſaith, *That ſhe cannot erre, neither in the Faith, nor in any weighty point of Faith.* And from *Doctor Field* he aſſerts, *That ſhe cannot fall into Hereſie*, &c. *That ſhe may erre*

Archb. *Lawd*, Conſer. Sect. 37. Numb. 3.

Id. ib. ſect. 21. n. 5.

Ibid.

Ibid.

erre indeed in ſuperſtructions and deductions, and other unneceſſary Truths, from her curioſity or other weakneſs. But if ſhe can erre either by falling away from the Foundation totally, or by heretical error in it, ſhe can no longer be holy: (for no Aſſemblies of Hereticks can be holy:) And ſo that Article of the Creed, [I believe the holy Catholick Church] *is gone. Now this holineſs,* ſaith he, *Errors of a meaner allay take not away from the Church.* The ſame *Archbiſhop* likewiſe acknowledges, *that a General Council* de poſt facto *is unerrable*: that is, when the *Deciſions* of it are received and admitted generally by *Catholicks*.

Id. ſect. 33. n. 14.

4. Thus far goes the *Arch-Biſhop*, attended by *Doctor Field*, *Doctor White*, &c. But being neceſſarily obliged to maintain the ſeparation of his own *Church* from the *Roman*, *&c.* he (treating of that point) extends moſt enormouſly the Errors of the *Church* in non-Fundamentals; for then, forgeting his former phraſes of unprofitable *curioſities*, *unneceſſary ſubtilties*, *unneceſſary Doctrines*, *to which her curioſity or weakneſs, may carry her beyond her Rule*, he ſaith, *The Roman Church held the Fundamentals literally, yet ſhe erred groſly; dangerouſly, nay damnably in the expoſition of ſome of them*: *That ſhe had Errors, though not Fundamental, yet grating upon the Foundation*, &c. Now what he ſpeaks of the *Roman*,

Id. Sect. 21. n. 5.

Id. Sect. 37. n. 5. 6.

man, is manifeſt, muſt as well be applied to the *Eaſtern Church too*; and ſo to the whole *Church Catholick* at *Luthers* diſceſſion, for moſt of the *Doctrines* found fault with by *Proteſtants* in the *Roman Church*, themſelves ſee to have been, and ſtill to be taught by the *Eaſtern*, &c. with an acceſſion of other Errors, from which the *Roman* is free.

5. Hitherto theſe *Writers* ſpeak of the *Authority* of the *Church* onely in generals: *The Church*, ſay they, *cannot Erre in Fundamentals*; *She may Erre in non-Fundamentals*: But who is to diſcern between *Fundamentals* and *non-Fundamentals?* And who is to judg of the *Churches* Error in *non-Fundamentals?* Doctor *Field* will tell us to this purpoſe, *That no particular man or Church, may ſo much as profeſs publickly, that they think otherwiſe then has been determined in a general Council, except with theſe three limitations.* 1. *Unleſs he know moſt certainly the contrary to what the Church has determined.* 2. *If there be no gainſaying of men of worth, place and eſteem?* 3. *If there appear nothing that may argue an unlawful proceeding.* And the *Arch-Biſhop* briefly to this effect, ſtates the Point: *That General Councils, lawfully called and ordered, and lawfully proceeding, are a great and awful repreſentation, and cannot erre in matters of Faith, upon condition.* 1. *That they*

Dr. *Field* of the Church cap. 5. p. 666.

Laud Sect. 33. con. 5. n. 1.

they keep themſelves to God's Rule, and not attempt to make a new one of their own. 2. And they are with all ſubmiſſion to be obſerved by every Chriſtian, where Scripture, or evident demonſtration come not againſt them.

6. Theſe are their limitations, and ſure it was a very great neceſſity, that forced ſuch wiſe and learned men, to grant ſo licentious a liberty, for annulling what ever hath been, or ſhall be determined by the Supream Tribunal in *Gods Church*. A liberty never heard, or thought of from *Doctor Pierces beginning*, I am certain. A liberty manifeſtly deſtructive to all their own *Articles*, *Canons*, and *Acts* of *Parliament*: For ſure they will not ſay, that theſe are of more ſacred and inviolable *Authority*, then thoſe of the whole *Church*: Do none pretend to know moſt certainly the contrary to thoſe determinations? or do none of *worth*, *place*, and *eſteem*, gainſay them, when all the Chriſtian world Reform'd, and non-Reform'd, except a little portion of *England*, abſolutely reject them? Laſtly, does nothing appear, that may argue an unlawful proceeding in *Hen.* the *Eighths* firſt Reformation, or K. *Edwards*, or Q. *Elizabeths?* But there was no poſſible avoiding the conceſſion of this liberty, apparently ruinous to themſelves; becauſe they have uſurped it againſt the whole Church, could not refuſe it to any that would make uſe of it to deſtroy their own.

7. Let

7. Let us here briefly examine these *Grounds*, laid by the *Arch-Bishop*, &c. *viz.* 1. *The Church is unerrable in Fundamentals, but subject to error in non-Fundamentals.* 2. *The Decisions of General Councils, are to be observed, where Scripture, or evident Demonstration come not against them.*

8. In these *Assertions* is included a Supposition not denied by *Catholicks*, That even among Doctrines determin'd by the Church, there are some which are in themselves *fundamental*, others not so: but yet withal those *Doctrines* which in themselves are *not fundamental*, being once determin'd by the Church, are necessary to be assented to by all *Catholicks*, to whom they are so represented, for in those circumstances, Obedience is a fundamental duty. But though *Catholicks* allow this distinction in general, they withal profess, it is impossible for any particular persons of themselves to determin among all the *Churches Decisions*, and say, *this* or *this* Point is necessary and fundamental, the others not. And the reason is, because the terms *Necessary*, *Fundamental*, &c. are relative terms when applied: for that is necessary to be believed and known by one, which is not so by another: Many *Doctrines* are *necessary* to *Churches* for their well ordering, which are not so to any *single persons*, *Parishes*, &c.

&c. For this reason all Decisions of the Church are sacred to them; no permission to question any of them is allow'd: and by this means the *Church* is continued in *unity*, and by assenting to all *Decisions*, they are sure never to dissent from those that are *necessary*. Whereas *Protestants* taking a liberty of discerning between *fundamentals* and *non-fundamentals*, and of dissenting in *non-fundamentals* at least, wherein they think the *Church Catholick* may be *fallible* (though they have no Rule by which to judg so) are, besides a certainty of dis-union, exposed to errours even in *fundamentals*.

9. The *ground* upon which those learned *Protestants* conclude a *fallibility* even in the *universal Church* as to *Doctrines not fundamental* [besides the manifest interest of their own Church] is because the end why *Christ* made such promises of leading his Church into all Truth, was, lest *the Gates of Hell should prevail against her*, which can be done only by *Heresies* against fundamental Doctrines: and therefore God's assistance for other Points not *fundamental*, is not to be presumed on.

10. But, though this *Position* in general were allow'd them, That the Church is fallible in *unnecessaries*, this will not excuse them for dissenting from the *Church* in

in any particular Doctrines actually decided by a General Council. Themſelves acknowledge that all diſſenting even internal is unlawful without a certain demonſtration, that the Church hath actually erred in ſuch and ſuch Doctrines. But which way poſſibly can any particular, perſon, or Church, arrive to ſuch a demonſtration? It muſt be by producing expreſs *Scripture*, or univerſal *Tradition*, formally oppoſite and contradictory to what the univerſal Church hath declared. Who can think, who dares believe, that thoſe ſupreme *Guides* of all Chriſtians, who were by our Lord placed in the Church, and graced with ſuch promiſes, who are the only *Guardians* of the Scripture it ſelf, and only unappealable *Judges* of the ſenſe of it, ſhould conſpire to propoſe Doctrines formally and manifeſtly contrary to expreſs Scripture or evident demonſtration? And as for *univerſal Tradition*, there can be no *Judge* of it, but the whole *Church*: particular perſons, or Churches, are utterly uncapable of making ſuch a judgment, eſpecially in oppoſition to the whole Church.

11. It were happie therefore, if *Proteſtants*, conſidering the *Promiſes* of *Chriſt*, and the neceſſity of unity in the Church, would allow but as much ſubmiſſion to

the *Supreme Tribunal* of his *Church*, as *God* obliged the *Jews* to perform to their *Sanedrim*, to which no such Promises were made. For then, though *in Thesi* they did affirm the Church to be *fallible*, yet they would acknowledge, that not only all declaration of non-assenting is forbidden, but an internal assent is of necessary obligation to every one of her Decisions.

Deut. 17. 12. Let them seriously consider the passage of *Deuteronomy* heretofore produced, in which *God commands the* Jews *under the penalty of death, to obey whatsoever sentence should be pronounced by the present Judges of those dayes in any Controversies touching the Law.* This Precept argues that the *Supreme Council* of the *Jews* was infallible in Fundamentals. And indeed God had promised that *the Scepter*

Gen. 49. 10. *should not depart from* Judah, *nor a Lawgiver from between his knees till Shiloh* (that is the *Messias*) *came.* By vertue of which *Promise* the *Jewish Religion* could not fail in *Fundamentals*: and the effect of this *Promise* was manifestly performed: For as to the outward profession and practises of the *Mosaical Law*, it was alwayes continued, in so much as our *Saviour*

Matth. 23. himself enjoyned Obedience to all the Commands of those *who sate in* Moses *his Chair.* I say as to the outward practises of

of it: For in the Spiritual ſenſe of it, the *Jewiſh Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrates* were horribly perverted, ſo far as to oppoſe and Murder the *Meſſiah* himſelf, typified therein; But now *Shiloh* was already come, and God's promiſe of Indefectibility reſted in this New High Prieſt, and his Succeſſors.

13. Notwithſtanding all this, yet Errors might creep in about *non-fundamentals*, as the *Rabbins* confeſs, when they ſuppoſe a future *Sanedrim* might annul the *Deciſions* of a former Council; in which caſe the *Ordinances* of the *later* muſt take place, and without all tergiverſation be obeyed. So as though they, being indeed in ſuch things fallible, ſhould command any thing contrary to the true ſenſe of the *Law*, the *Jews* were under the utmoſt penalty obliged to obey them, which obedience required a ſubmiſſion of Judgment and internal aſſent to ſuch Commands, that they were agreeable to God's Law, becauſe it would be utterly unlawful to obey any commands of men, which the Subject believed to be contrary to God's Law. Now the reaſonableneſs of this Command of God appears in this, That it was a leſs evil and inconvenience that ſome *Legal Precepts* of no great importance ſhould be tranſgreſſed, than that Contentions and Diſputes ſhould be endleſs.

14. From this pattern *Protestants* may be instructed, that though they should allow a *General Council* no more obliging Authority, than the *Jews* did to their *Sanedrim*, which was infallible in *fundamentals*, but subject to Error in *non-fundamentals*, they can never have a warrant to Dissent from any Decisions of such a Council, but ought to submit their internal Judgment to them. For, since it is impossible they should have any demonstrative proofs that such *Councils* have *de facto* erred, I mean in matter of Doctrine; all other inferiour Judgments, all only *probable* Arguments against them, ought to cease; the Judgment of the whole *Church* rendring all contrary opinions altogether improbable. So that though (upon their Supposition that the *Church* in non-fundamentals is *fallible*) she should have erred in such not-much-concerning *Decisions*, and by consequence their assent would be erroneous, yet that small incommodity would be abundantly recompenc'd with the most acceptable vertue of *Obedience*, humble submission of Judgment, love of Peace and Unity which accompanies it. Besides, that both *Truth* and *Errour* in such things lyes only on the Churches, and not at all on their account.

15. But

15. But ſince *Proteſtants* find an extraordinary difficulty more than *Catholicks*, to ſubmit their Judgments to *Authority*, and are apt to think all their opinions and perſwaſions to be certain knowledges; Let it be ſuppoſed that their firſt *Reformers* not being able to perſwade themſelves to renounce their Opinions, ſhould thereupon have been excommunicated by the Church: In this caſe they ought to have ſuffered ſuch Cenſures with patience, and not voluntarily forſake her Communion; and much leſs ought they to have ſet up, or repair to an *Anti-communion*: For that was in the higheſt degree a *Formal Schiſm*.

16. In all this diſcourſe touching the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, and the unlawfulneſs of ſeparation from it; I do not mean a *Church of one denomination*, no, not the *Roman*, as ſuch, for ſo we aſcribe not *Infallibility* to her: But I intend the *Univerſal Church*, which we call *Roman Catholick*, becauſe all true *Orthodox Churches* (an union of which, conſtitutes the Univerſal Church) acknowledge the *Roman Church*, to be the Root of their Unity. Therefore *Proteſtants*, in vain, ſeek to excuſe their ſeparation, upon pretence it was onely from the *Roman*, not from the *Univerſal Church*: becauſe, 1. A *ſeparation* from the external Communion of

any one true *Member* of the *Catholick Church*, for Doctrines which are commonly held by other Churches in communion with that Member, is indeed a ſeparation from all Churches; which is manifeſtly the caſe of the *Engliſh ſeparation*. 2. Becauſe it is evident, that the pretended Reformed Churches, really ſeparated themſelves *a toto mundo*. A thing which *Calvin* confeſſeth in an Epiſtle of his to *Melanthon*, in theſe words, *Nec non parvi refert*, &c. *For it doth not a little concern us, that not the leaſt ſuſpition of any diſcord riſen among us, deſcend to poſterity: For it were a thing more then abſurd, after we have been conſtrained to make a diſceſſion from the whole world, if we, in our very beginnings, ſhould alſo divide from one another.* And which *Chillingworth* alſo confeſſeth in ſeveral places, *cap.* 5. *ſect.* 55. *As for the external Communion of the viſible Church*, (ſaith he) *we have, without ſcruple formerly granted, that Proteſtants did forſake it: that is, renounce the practiſe of ſome obſervances, in which, the whole viſible Church before them, did communicate.* And *ſect.* 56. *What do you conclude* (ſaith he) *from hence, but that ſeeing there was no viſible Church, but corrupted,* [where note, that he muſt affirm not only corruptions in manners, but alſo in Doctrines and Lawes, for from ſeveral of theſe, he will not deny *Luther* to have made

made a diſceſſion] *Luther forſaking the external Communion of the corrupted* Church, *could not but forſake the external communion of the Catholick* Church. *Well, let this be granted; what will come of it? That* Luther *muſt be a Sciſmatick? By no means.* I ſay, it is evident (as theſe confeſs) that the pretended Reformed *Churches really ſeparated themſelves from the whole world*, that is, from that holy Catholick *Church* which we believe is to continue ſo in every Age: Since not one Church upon earth antecedent to their ſeparation, can be found out with which they are joyned in external Communion, not one which has Laws, or Governors in common with them, not one that will joyn with them, or with which they will joyn in publick *Offices*, *Lyturgies*, *Sacrifices* and *Synods*. The *Engliſh Church* doth not pretend a Communion with Churches manifeſtly Heretical, as the *Armenian*, *Coptite*, *Abiſſine*, *Neſtorian*, *Jacobite*, *Georgian* Churches, *&c.* And for the *Grecian*, the *Reformers*, at their firſt ſeparation, were actually divided from her; and ſure they will not ſay, that by ſeparation from the *Roman*, they became *ipſo facto* in communion with the *Grecian*; or if they would ſay ſo, the *Grecian* would proteſt againſt them, as we ſee their *Patriark Hieremias* did, &c.

Dr. Bramhall.

17. And that is but a very ineffectual *Salve*, which a late *learned Protestant Writer* in his discourse of *Schism*, insists upon, when, seeing clearly the *English Church* could not pretend a *Communion* with any other Ancient Churches in the world, he therefore claims priviledges of the *English Church*, equal to those ancient ones of *Cyprus*; which was a *Church* independent of all other, and exempted from the Jurisdiction of the *Eastern Patriark of Antioch*: For though this pretention could be made good, which is impossible, yet this would not serve their turn, considering the *English Church*, ever since her Conversion, acknowledged her self a Member of the *Western Patriarchate*: But though she had indeed such a priviledge, and never renounced it, who will say the *Cyprian Church*, (because exempted from certain Acts of *Patriarckical Jurisdiction*, as *Ordinations*, *Visitations*, &c.) could therefore independently of all the world, frame or change *Articles of Faith*, or be excused from subscribing to the *Decisions* of *Councils*, though onely *Patriarckical*?

CHAP.

CHAP. XXII.

The limitations of the Churches Authority, made by Arch-Biſhop Lawd, &c. *examined. Objections againſt the Proceedings in the Council of* Trent, *anſwered. Manifeſt Illegality in Q.* Eliz. *Reformation. Secular and Carnal ends in it.*

1. HAving ſhew'd the indiſpenſible obligation of even an internal aſſent that *Roman Catholicks* acknowledge due to the *Deciſions of General Councils*, as being infallible, and which *Proteſtants* ought alſo to perform, though they acknowledge ſuch an infallibility to extend only to Doctrines Fundamental; ſince the Church her ſelf hath not declar'd which of her Deciſions are Fundamental, and

and which not, for ſhe hath affixed *Anathemas* to many, which in themſelves are not Fundamental, and hath ſaid only, *ſi quis dixerit* (not) *ſi quis non crediderit*, concerning Doctrines which are unqueſtionably *Fundamental* and neceſſary: We will now examine the foremention'd *Limitations* or caſes in which it is ſaid particular perſons or Churches may and ought to be diſpenſed with for yielding an aſſent to *Deciſions* of *General Councils* touching matters not Fundamental, or even for not contradicting them; which limitations have been fixed by *Archbiſhop Lawd*, *Doctor Field*, &c.

2. In the firſt place, *An aſſent even internal*, ſay they, *is to be given indiſpenſably to all Deciſions of General Councils touching ſuch Doctrines (only) as are Fundamental, or Points of neceſſary Faith, becauſe ſo far and no farther their Infallibility extends.* But who ſhall, or can judge what Points are or are not of *neceſſary Faith* with reſpect to all particular ſtates of men or Churches, when the Church her ſelf hath not made any diſtinction between them, and perhaps cannot? Surely *Prudence*, and a moſt neceſſary care of our own Salvation, by continuing in the Unity of the Church, would dictate to us, that ſince the Church is as to Fundamentals infallible, and therefore cannot miſlead us to our dan-

danger, there can be no ſafety but in aſſenting to all her *Deciſions*, as if they were of neceſſary Faith, for only by doing ſo, we can be ſure not to err in neceſſary Points, and we ſhall be certainly free from all danger of *Schiſm*.

3. Secondly, *As to Deciſions made by General Councils of Doctrines not neceſſary* (if we could find them out) *the ſame internal aſſent*, ſay they, *is due, except in two caſes.* 1. *Unleſs Scripture or evident demonſtration come againſt them, whereby we know moſt certainly the contrary to what they have determined, in which caſe it is unlawful to aſſent, yea it is permitted rather to contradict and ſeparate.* But let any Chriſtian mans conſcience judge, whether this be to be admitted as a fitting, reſpectful, or even poſſible ſuppoſition, that the whole *Church* ſhould conſpire to frame Deciſions in matters of *Chriſtian Doctrine*, againſt which expreſs Scripture or evident demonſtration can be produced. This licence being admitted, who ſhall be judge, whether that which is pretended to be a Demonſtration, be really one, or no? Or whether a perſon do know moſt certainly the contrary to what the whole Church hath decided? None can judge of the thoughts of another: So that upon theſe grounds, whoever ſhall ſay he is certain the Church hath erred, muſt be believed,

or

or however cannot be found fault with-all for his renouncing obedience to the Univerſal Church. What *Presbyterian*, writing or diſputing againſt *Epiſcopacy* or other Doctrines of this Church, will doubt to ſay, that he does moſt certainly believe and know ſuch *Doctrines* to be Errors? And if he ſay ſo, who can demonſtrate, that he does not think ſo? And if he think ſo, he may queſtion, contradict, and make parties to reverſe all the *Laws*, Deciſions, &c. both of the *Engliſh* and *God's Church* too, by the *Archbiſhop's* warrant; for he taking notice (*page* 245.) that ſuch an Objection will be made, reſolves it thus, *That a General Council* (he means *another* General Council) *muſt decide, whether it be a demonſtration or not*; Hence it will follow, 1. That when any one cries a Demonſtration, he cannot be reduced to obedience till another *General Council* be called. 2. But if *another General Council* muſt decide it, why hath not the *laſt General Council*, which he diſobeys, decided it? Or if this may not oblige him, why ſhould the next? But this is not yet judged to be diſpenſation enough; For according to the foreſaid limitations, *One may be excuſed from aſſenting to Deciſions of General Councils, about Points not of neceſſary Faith, in caſe they be gainſaid by men of worth, place and eſteem*: So that if any

any ſuch perſons do contradict *General Councils* (whether in or out of the Council, He mentions not) ignorant men may lawfully join with them, and in compariſon eſteem all other Paſtors of God's Church to be of leſs worth, place or eſteem. What a broad Gate, yea how vaſt a breach have theſe *Doctors*, with all their learning and prudence, made in the walls of God's Church, to let in all manner of *confuſion*? Can any *Proteſtant* now deny *Smectymnuus*, *Mr. Prinn*, the *Rump Parliament* to have been perſons of *worth*, *place* and *eſteem*? At leaſt the generality of *England* once thought them ſo, and themſelves challenged thoſe Titles, and whilſt they were the ſtrongeſt, enjoy'd them. To what miſerable ſtraits a neceſſity of juſtifying the *Engliſh Separation* reduced ſuch wiſe and learned men?

4. In the *third place*, according to the ſame Writers Poſition, all manner of *Deciſions* made by *Councils*, both in neceſſary and unneceſſary Doctrines, ceaſe to be obligatory, *in caſe ſomething appears that may argue an unlawful proceeding in the* Council, *out of paſſion, intereſt, want of liberty*, &c. But ſtill who ſhall be judges of *Councils* proceedings? Among *Catholicks*, when there are perhaps ſuſpicions of ſome irregular proceedings, yet if the *Points* decided be embraced by the particular *Catholick*

tholick Churches, generally ſpeaking, they then have the force of unqueſtion'd *Catholick Doctrines*. But as for thoſe, who are enemies to *Councils*, in which their Doctrines have been condemn'd, ſuch will be ſure to charge them with unlawful proceedings. For did not the *Arians* urge that *Plea* againſt the *Council of Nice*? The *Neſtorians* againſt that of *Epheſus*? The *Eutychians* againſt that of *Chalcedon*?

5. This clauſe in all probability was put in to exclude the Authority of the *Council* of *Trent*; againſt the proceedings of which therefore, very loud and very unjuſt clamors were made by *Proteſtants*, imputing eſpecially to the *Court of Rome* many policies and attempts either to intimidate the Fathers of the Council, or to induce them to favour, and enlarge the *Grandeurs* of the *Pope*. But who ever ſhall unpaſſionately read the *Hiſtory* of that *Council*, compiled by the moſt learned and *eminent Cardinal Palavicino* from authentick *Records* yet extant, will be ſatisfied. 1. That the liberty of the *Biſhops* was only ſtraitned by their own reſpective temporal *Princes*, and not by the *Roman Court*. 2. That the *Pope* was ſo far from gaining an acceſs to his *Authority*, that when a far greater number of the *Biſhops* would have concurr'd thereto, the *Pope* himſelf forbad it, meerly becauſe the

French

French Bishops, inconsiderable for their numbers, did joyn to oppose it.

6. But there is no necessity that *Catholicks* should trouble themselves with making *Apologies* for that *Council*. 1. Because all the Doctrines of it, opposed by *Protestants*, as *Novelties*, were manifest in the general Writings and Practise of the *Western Church* long before that *Council*; and most of them in the *Eastern*. 2. Because they are now actually embraced by all *Catholick Congregations*, as *Declared Doctrines* of the *Church*: in which case by the *Archbishop*'s own Concessions, they are to be esteem'd *infallibly true*. 3. Because the principal Doctrines, censur'd in the *Preacher's Sermon*, had been expressly determin'd by former either *General*, or at least *Patriarkical Councils*, admitted in this Kingdom: as *Transubstantiation*, *Veneration of Images*, *Prayers not in a vulgar tongue*, *Communion under one Species*, *Celibacy of Priests*, *the universal Jurisdiction of the Pope*, &c. 4. And lastly, because, in condemning the *Protestant Doctrines* opposite to them, the *Bishops* of the *Council of Trent* are found, even by * *Padre Paulo's*

* See the English Edition of that History, concerning *Transubstantiation and Adoration of the Eucharist*, pag. 324, & 326. — Concerning *the Masse, that it is a Propitiatory sacrifice*, p. 544, 545, & 738. — Concerning *the Lawfulness & Sufficiency of Communicating in one kind*, pag. 324, 325, 519. — Concerning *Purgatory*; *the Lawfulness of Invocation of Saints*, and of *Veneration of Images*, p. 799, 803. — Concerning *the Lawfulness of not using some part of the Divine Service in a vulgar Language*, p. 573, 574. — Concerning *Priests not Marrying*; and *the universal Capacity of the Gift of Chastity*; and *the Lawfulness of Vowing it*, p. 783, 747. and likewise, p. 678, 679.]

Relation

Relation (no favourer of that *Council*) unanimous in their Judgment; which the *Reader* may there ſee, if he pleaſe to examine their Votes concerning thoſe *Points*. Neither did; nor needed the *Pope*, or his adherents, to uſe any artifice herein to gain the Suffrages of a *Major part*: And this is, in that Hiſtory of his, only pretended to be done in other matters of Conteſt among Catholicks themſelves.

7. Therefore it would certainly be much more for the good of Conſcientious *Proteſtants* to reflect ſeriouſly on the method of their *Reformations*: and then let them be Judges of the legality of their proceedings, and the diſintereſſedneſs of their firſt Reformers. I ſpeak not now of *Presbyterian* Reformations, which in all Countreys have been uſher'd in with Tumults, Rebellions, Murders, Rapines, Diſſolution of Monarchies, &c. but of the *Engliſh Reformation* only, which though free from ſuch horrible Crimes, yet how legal it was, how free from worldly and carnal Intereſts, let their own Hiſtorians be Judges.

8. And firſt, This Relation is made of it in general by *Dr. Heylin*; *In Queen Elizabeths time* (ſaith he) *before the new Biſhops were well ſetled* [I need not mind the Reader here, that all her former Biſhops,

Reform. Juſtified, *pag.* 37.

Biſhops, ſave one, had deſerted her] *and the Queen, aſſured of the affections of her Clergy, went that way to work in Her Reformation, which not only her two Predeceſſors, but all the godly Kings and Princes in the Jewiſh State and many of the Chriſtian Emperours in the primitive times had done before her, in the well ordering of the Church and People committed to their care and government by Almighty God. And to that end ſhe publiſhed her Injunctions,* Ann. Dom. 1559. *A Book of Orders,* 1561. *Another of Advertiſements,* 1562. *All leading unto the Reformation, with the Advice and Conſent of the Metropolitan, and ſome other Godly Prelats who were then about Her* [theſe were thoſe newly Ordained, the former Biſhops being ejected] *by whom they were agreed on, and ſubſcribed unto, before they were preſented to Her. But when the times were better ſetled, and the firſt difficulty of her Reign paſſed over, ſhe left Church-work to the diſpoſing of Church-men, who, by their place and calling, were moſt proper for it; and they, being met in Convocation, and thereto authorized as the Laws required, did make and publiſh ſeveral Books of Canons, &c.* Thus that Doctor; the ſum of which is, That the Queen, finding no foundation to build upon, becauſe all the Innovations begun by her Father and young Brother, had been utterly demoliſhed by her Siſter

Queen *Mary*, and withal perceiving the main Body of her Clergy, as well as her Bishops, except such as she caused to be made *de novo*, to be generally averse from her proceedings, was fain to do all the Ecclesiastical work her self, assisted with some of her New Bishops, without the Concurrence of any Synodal Authority; till, having first by her Orders sufficiently purged the Clergy, she saw, she could securely now do Church-work by Churchmen.

Fuller Hist. l. 9. p. 54.

9. But Mr. *Fuller* is more punctual in delivering the retail of these her first proceedings, which he extracted out of the authentick *Synodals*, 1559. He tells us then, That in the beginning of her Reign, the *Queen* called both a *Parliament* and a *Convocation of the Clergy*: Which *Convocation* unanimously persisted in a resolution not to forsake the old Religion restored by *Queen Mary*, and publickly declared against such an intended *Reformation*. Particularly the *body* of the *inferiour Clergy* composed certain *Articles* of Religion, which they tendred to the *Bishops*, and the Bishops in the Name of the whole Clergy, presented them to the *Lord Keeper*. The said *Articles* were these five, 1. *Of the real substantial presence of our Lord's body after Consecration.* 2. *Of the non-remaining of the substance of Bread and*

and Wine. 3. *Of the Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Maſſe.* 4. *Of the Supreme Spiritual Juriſdiction of the Pope.* 5. *That the power not only of defining, but even treating and ordering of Eccleſiaſtical matters touching Doctrine and Diſcipline pertains only to Spiritual Paſtors, and not at all to Lay perſons.* A little after this, during the ſame Convocation, there came from both the *Univerſities* a *Writing* ſigned by a *Publick Notary*, by which they both ſignified their Concurrence to the aforeſaid *Articles*, only with a little alteration of the laſt.

10. I have thought fit to annex here the very words of that Convocation, as Dr. *Fuller* tranſcribed them out of the Synodal Book, 1559.

Reverendi in Chriſto Patres ac Domini Colendiſſimi.

QVoniam Famâ Publicâ referente ad noſtram nuper notitiam pervenit, multa Religionis Chriſtianæ Dogmata publico & unanimi gentium Chriſtianarum conſenſu hactenus recepta & probata, atque ab Apoſtolis ad nos uſque concorditer per manus deducta præſertim Articulos infra ſcriptos, in dubium vocari. Hinc eſt, quod Nos Cantuarienſis Provinciæ inferior Secundarius Clerus in uno (Deo ſic diſponente, ac Sereniſſimæ Dominæ noſtræ Re-

gine, Decani & Capitali Cant: Mandato Brevi Parliamenti ac monitione Ecclesiasticâ solitâ declaratâ id exigente) convenientes, partium nostrarum esse existimavimus, tum nostræ, tum eorum, quorum cura nobis committitur, saluti, omnibus quibus poterimus modis prospicere. Quocirca Majorum nostrorum exemplis commoti; qui in similia sepe tempora inciderunt, fidem, quam in Articulis infrà Scriptis veram esse credimus, & ex animo profitemur, ad Dei laudem & honorem, Officiisque, & aliarum nostræ curæ commissarum animarum exonerationem, presentibus, duximus, publice asserendam, affirmantes, & sicut Deus nos in die Judicij adiuvet, asserentes.

1. *Quod in Sacramento Altaris, virtute Christi verbo suo à Sacerdote debite prolato assistentis, præsens est realiter sub speciebus panis & vini naturale Corpus Christi conceptum de Virgine Mariâ. Item naturalis ejus sanguis.*

2. *Item. Quod post Consecrationem non remanet substantia panis & vini, neque ulla alia substantia, nisi substantia Dei & Hominis.*

3. *Item. Quod in Missâ offertur verum Christi corpus & verus ejusdem sanguis, Sacrificium propitiatorium pro vivis & defunctis.*

4. *Item. Quod Petro Apostolo & ejus legitimis Successoribus in sede Apostolicâ tanquam*

quam Christi Vicario data est suprema potestas pascendi & regendi Ecclesiam Christi militantem, & fratres suos confirmandi.

5. *Item. Quod authoritas tractandi & definiendi de iis quæ spectant ad fidem, Sacramenta, & disciplinam Ecclesiasticam, hactenus semper spectavit & spectare debet tantum ad Pastores Ecclesiæ, quos Spiritus Sanctus in hoc, in Ecclesia Dei, posuit; & non ad Laicos.*

Quam nostram assertionem, affirmationem & fidem, nos inferior Clerus prædictus vestris Paternitatibus tenore præsentium exhibemus; humiliter supplicantes, ut quia nobis non est copia hanc nostram sententiam et intentionem aliter illis, quorum in hac parte interest, notificandi, Vos qui Patres estis, ista superioribus ordinibus significare velitis. Qua in re officium charitatis ac pietatis (ut arbitramur) præstabitis, & saluti gregis vestri, ut par est prospicietis, & vestras ipsi animas liberabitis.

But what effect had these Declarations and Protestations of the whole representative Clergy and Universities? All that could be got was a Disputation, the orderly proceeding whereof, and conclusion, may be seen in *Fox* and *Camden*, A.D. 1559.

Neither can the *salvo* used by M. *Thorndick*, who proceeds somewhat otherwise in this point, then the *Arch-Bishop*, or Dr. *Field*, be rationally admitted here. || Who first yields, that if the Clergy of

|| Right of Church in a Christian State p. 247. 248. &c.

that time when the Reformation began, (he means the Clergy in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Raign) had been supported in that Power, which by the premises [in his Book] is challenged on behalf of the Clergy, the Reformation could not have been brought to pass, and grants, ‖ that secular power gave force to that which was done contrary to the Rule, wherein the Unity of the Church consisted: But yet justifies the Reformation thus, ‖ He saith, that as the power of the Church (obliging Christians to their Decisions) is a Law ordained by the Apostles, for the Unity and edification of the Church,&c. So, also there are abundance of other Laws given to the Church, by our Lord and his Apostles: And that therefore, if by injurie of the times, the practice (of the Church) become contrary to these Lawes, [given by Christ and his Apostles]; or if those, whom the power of the Church is trusted with, shall hinder the restoring of such Lawes, (of Christ and his Apostles) the Soveraign Power being Christian, may and ought to suppress their power, (though he grants this their power to be an Ordinance of the Apostles, necessary to the Unity of the Church); that so their power may be committed to such as are willing to submit to the Superior Ordinance of our Lord and his Apostles.

‖ Ibid. p.251.

‖ Pag. 273,&c.

poſtles. A thing (ſaith he) ‖ throughly proved, both by the right of Secular powers in advancing Chriſtianity with penalties, and in eſtabliſhing the exerciſe of it, and in particular, by all the examples of the pious Kings of Gods people, reducing the Law into practice, and ſuppreſſing the contrary thereof. Thus Mr. *Thorndicke* takes this way of freeing the *Engliſh* Reformation from Schiſm, upon the juſt Reforming power of the ſecular Prince againſt all, or moſt of his Clergy, when he judgeth them to teach or practiſe againſt the Doctrine of our Lord and his Apoſtles. But all this while, he never ſo much as asks the queſtion, what if the Prince be miſtaken in theſe Doctrines which he calls of our Lord and his Apoſtles; Or be miſtaken in what the Ancient Church, and primitive times have delivered for ſuch? And what if all the Clergy which he oppoſeth be in the right? Nor this, What if our Lord hath committed this to the Clergy, and Succeſſors of the Apoſtles, to judg and decide for ever (when any doubt or diſpute ariſeth) what are the true Lawes of our Lord and his Apoſtles? Or, what ancient Tradition hath delivered to poſterity for ſuch? But he diſcourſeth ſo, as if the Chriſtian Prince were herein infallible, when yet he ſuppoſeth, that all his Clergy may be herein deceived: As ‖ Pag. 275.

if Queen *Elizabeth* understood the Scriptures, and ancient Tradition, aright in these Lawes, whilst her Bishops and Convocation erred in both, till she had new-moulded them. Is not this a strange way to justifie a Church-Reformation?

For the Kings of *Judah*, it shall be spoken to by and by, ‖ and as to what he urgeth concerning the power of Kings, it is by no means denied, that these have Supremacy proper to them, to command obedience from all their Subjects, and that as well from a Clergy-man, as any other, to the Lawes of Christ and his Apostles with the civil Sword, and with temporal penalties (a Supremacy to which the Church layes no claim). But when any doubt or controversie ariseth, what, or which these Lawes be, (as there was in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Raign in many points) Secular Princes as well as others, are Sons of the Church, and are to learn this from the Expositions of their Spiritual Fathers, the Church-Men. I mean that body of them, which hath the just and Superior Authority of deciding such controversies. And let this suffice to shew the legality of the first proceedings of the Reformation, in opposition to the unanimous Votes of the whole Clergy, or of those therein, who clearly had the decisive power of Ecclesiastical Controversies

‖ Chap. 23. n. 7.

ſies either concerning the ſenſe of Scriptures or Truth of ancient Tradition.

12. Then comparing this Reformation with the *Council of Trent*, in regard of worldly or carnal intereſts, let any indifferent man judge between them. Was not the liberty obtained by King *Henry* the Eighth, to bring into his Bed, a new handſom Wife, inſtead of his former vertuous Queen, a very carnal Intereſt? Was not his invading all the *poſſeſſions* and treaſure of *Monaſteries* a great ſecular Intereſt? was not the *dividing* the ſaid Lands, among the *Nobility* and *Gentry* at very eaſie rates, a very great intereſt? In King *Edwards* daies, was not the *Protectors* ſeizing on the remainder of Church-ſpoils a great Intereſt? Was not the freeing of Clergymen, from a neceſſity of ſaying daily, and almoſt howerly, long *Eccleſiaſtical Offices*, from lying a lone without bedfellows, &c. Matters of great, both carnal and ſecular Intereſts? Was not the exempting of all, both laity and Eccleſiaſticks from the Duty of confeſſing their ſins, and ſubmitting themſelves to penitential ſatisfactions; from rigorous Faſts out of Conſcience and Religion, and other auſterities, a matter of conſiderable intereſt, to fleſh and corrupt nature? Can any ſuch intereſts as theſe be proved to have been operative in the *Council of Trent*? How far all theſe inter-

intereſts of the world and fleſh, had influence on the firſt godly *Reformers*, we may rationally ſuſpect, but God only knows, and themſelves long before this time feel; *God is not mocked.*

13. By what hath been hitherto ſaid appears but even too clearly, how that *Fundamental Rule of all Government* and ſubordination was utterly neglected in *England*, at the time that the pretended *Reformation* was contrived and executed. Here is a new and thorow moulding of a Church, both in *Doctrines* and *Diſcipline*, *called* a *Reformation*, wherein all the *Synodical Acts* of this Church, ſince Chriſtianity entred among us, are as to any obliging power by their Authority reverſed: wherein all the *Deciſions* of *Patriarchical Councils*, yea of *Oecumenical Synods* are call'd into examination; all their Laws, ſo far as ſeemed meet reform'd, the whole regard that *England* had to all other *Catholick Churches*, as a *Member* of the whole, is utterly broken by one National Church: Nay not ſo much, but by one luxurious King, by one Child, and by one Woman, even when the whole *Body* of the *Clergy* proteſted againſt it. And yet after all this, if *Doctor Pierce* may be believed,

Pag. 35. *thus to reform was to write after the Copy which had been ſet to the Reformers in his Text, by the bleſſed Reformer of all the World; which was ſo to reform as not to innovate-*

novate, and to accommodate their Religion to what they found in the Beginning: In the mean time accuſing the *Church* of *Rome* (as he expreſſeth it, but indeed the *whole Catholick Church*, as he muſt, and as others grant) *of not only horrible corruptions in point of Practiſe, but hideous errors in matters of Faith too, & ſuch as trench upon Foundations.*

14. But the *Preacher* muſt not expect his confident aſſeveration without proof can ſeduce the judgement of any conſidering man to believe him againſt evidence and experience. Nothing is more plain then that the *Catholick Church*, by obſerving the foreſaid *Fundamental Rule*, is and will be eternally free from danger, either of *cauſal* or *formal Schiſm.* And as plain it is, that no Churches can be ſeparate from the *Catholick Communion* but by tranſgreſſing that *Rule*: For if *Dioceſan Churches* and Synods would ſubmit to *Provincial*; and *Provincial* to *National*, and theſe to *Patriarchical*, and all to *Oecumenical*, how could Unity be diſſolved? But on the contrary, if ſubordinate *Councils* ſhall take on them to reverſe the *Acts* and *Deciſions* of *Superior ones*, eſpecially of *Oecumenical*; how can *Schiſms* poſſibly be avoided? And with what ſhew of reaſon can any particular *Churches* thus breaking *Eccleſiaſtical* Orders, charge other *Churches* with *Schiſms*, becauſe they will not break them too? CHAP. Pag. 12.

CHAP. XXIII.

An Answer to the Doctor's Proofs alledged to justifie the lawfulness of the English Separation: *As,* 1. *From the Independent Authority of our Kings.* 2. *From the Examples of* Justinian *and other Emperors.* 3. *From the practises of fourteen of our Kings.* 4. *From the Examples of the Kings of* Juda. *In what sence New Articles of Faith are made by the Church in the Council of* Trent.

1. IT remains now that I answer the examples produced by the *Preacher* to justifie their *Separation* to be no *Schism*; he

he ſayes, That *by the conceſſions of the moſt learned Popiſh Writers, particular Nations had ſtill a power to purge themſelves from their corruptions, as well in the Church as in the State, without leave had from the See of Rome*: This is willingly granted. But do thoſe Writers concede ſuch a *purgation* as their firſt Reformers *adminiſtred* to this Kingdom? not only *without*, but *againſt* the conſent of the See of *Rome*, nor only of *Rome*, but of the whole Catholick Church? A *Purgation* from the whole *Faith* and *Diſcipline*, in any thing they judged fit to be rectified, that by the *Authority* of *Councils* and *Laws* of *Princes* had been received and in force ever ſince the Nation was *Chriſtian*: and by which they declared themſelves Members of the whole *Catholick Church*? On the contrary, from the beginning of Chriſtianity he will not be able to produce one *example*, either of *States* or *Princes*, except profeſs'd *Hereticks*, (ſuch as the Emperors *Conſtantius*, *Valens*, *Zeno*, &c.) that ever made any Laws to repeal any Doctrines declared or Diſciplines eſtabliſhed in the Church. The *Purgations* conceded and executed by *Princes* truly Catholick was to extirpate all *Innovations* in Doctrine, all tranſgreſſions of Diſcipline that ſwerved from the Decrees and Ordinations of the Church, and no other. Pag. 33.

2. Sure-

2. Surely the *Doctor* doth not think *Christian Princes*, as such, cease to be sons of the Church, they must be saved as well as their Subjects, and therefore are not dispensed from that speech of our Lord, *Qui vos audit, me audit.* They are not *Pastors*, but Sheep. Yet *Catholick Religion* obliges us to acknowledge, that their *Civil* power extends it self to all manner of causes, though purely *Ecclesiastical*; so as to make use of the *Civil Sword* in constraining even their *Ecclesiastical Subjects* to perform that duty which either the Moral and Divine Law (according to the Churches exposition thereof) or the Laws of the Church require. Such a power, yea a *Supremacy* in such a *Power* we acknowledge to be in *Princes*. But withal we cannot find either in reason or Antiquity any ground to apply to Princes that *Commission* which our Saviour only gave to the Apostles and their Successors [*Sicut misit me Pater*, &c.] *As my Father sent me, so send I you: Receive the holy Ghost*, &c. *Teach all Nations*, &c. No promise hath been made to *Princes*, that *God's Spirit shall lead them into all Truth*, any other way, then whilst they follow the direction of their *Ecclesiastical Pastors*, to whom only that *Promise* was made.

3. Nay, that very *Argument* by which he would assert his cause, is a Demonstration

tion againſt him. He ſayes, and that very truly, *Our Kings are as much as any in the world,* ἀνυπεύθυνοι, *they hold their Regal Authority immediately from God, without any dependence on any other authority on earth.* Serm. pag. 33. The like muſt be ſaid of other *abſolute Princes* too. Now this *independency* of *Princes* demonſtrates, that the regulation of their power in Eccleſiaſtical matters, muſt of neceſſity be made according to an Authority and *Juriſdiction* purely *ſpiritual* common to them all, which is in the Church. For otherwiſe, being *independent* and abſolute, they may perhaps be able to preſerve a kind of Unity in their reſpective Kingdoms, by forcing from their Subjects an Obedience to a *Religion* and *Church-policy* framed by themſelves, contrary to the Law of the Catholick Church: But how ſhall the *whole Church* be preſerved in Unity by this means? Other *Princes* are independent as well as they; and therefore may frame a Religion which they may call *Reformation*, as well as they: So that if there be not a *ſpiritual Director* and Eccleſiaſtical Laws common to them all, and ſubmitted to by all, what will become of *Unity*? Which of theſe *Independents* will make himſelf a *Dependent* on another? Shall there be *Patriarchicall*, or *General Councils of Kings* meet together? Who ſhall ſummon them? In

ſuch

such *Royal Synods* there must be order: which of them shall challenge a *Primacy*, even of *Order? Doctor Pierce* may see what consequences naturally and unavoidably flow from his *Positions*.

Pag. 34. 4. Touching the *Code and Novels of Justinian*, and the practice of *Charlemain* (for the Emperor *Zenos* Ἑνωτικον we leave to himself) he may please to cast a serious eye on their *Laws*, and will find they were all regulated by the Law of the present Church in their Times: The Churches *Faith* and her *Canons* for Discipline they reduced into *Imperial Laws*, to the end their Subjects might be more obedient to the Church, more averse from innovations in Doctrine, and irregularity in manners. And doth all this suit with the case of *English Protestants*? Can he justifie *King Henry the Eighths Oath of Supremacy* and *Head-ship* of the *Church*: or *King Edward the Sixths Reformatio legum Ecclesiasticarum*, or Q. *Eliz.* new *Articles* and *Canons*, by these Laws of the *Code* or *Capitulare*? Let the Emperor *Justinian* pronounce his Sentence in this matter [*Sancimus vicem Legum obtinere*, &c] *We ordain and command that the holy Ecclesiastical Rules declared and established by holy Councils shall obtain the force of Laws: For their* Doctrines *we receive as the Holy Scriptures themselves, and their* Rules

Justin. in Authent. de Eccles. Tit. & Privileg.

we

we obſerve as Lawes. Add again, to ſhew that the Laws, enacted by him, touching Eccleſiaſtical matters, were intended not as *Acts* of an abſolute *Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy*, but as conſequences of the Churches Authority, he ſaies, *Our Lawes diſdain not to follow the holy and Divine Rules* (of the Church). Theſe were indeed Lawes of *Reformation*, fit for glorious *Princes*, devout Sons of the Church, to make but ſurely very incommodious patterns for the *Preachers* purpoſe. Id. in Authent. ut Cler. ap. prop. Ep. 10. Conven.

5. What the late Emperours, *Ferdinand the firſt*, and *Maximilian the ſecond* did, neither his *Sermon*, nor *Margin* tell us, but onely that ſomething was done, which he, it ſeems, thought for his advantage; I'le tell him what it was: Their *Reformers* in *Germany* were grown very powerful; yet not ſo, but that they made a ſhew of hearkning to ſome compoſition. Thoſe worthy *Emperors*, for peace ſake, made ſeveral conſultations with learned and moderate *Catholicks*, (ſome indeed too moderate, as *Caſſander*, &c.) how the Church-*Doctrines* and *Ordinances* might be qualified. Hereupon divers expedients were propoſed, Treatiſes written, &c. by which the *Emperors* were in hope debates might be ended, But how? By betraying the preſent Churches Faith? By renouncing the *Popes Juriſdiction*, or conſent to a com- Serm. *pag.* 34.

position? Far otherwise; For when they saw no agreement would please the *Lutheran Electors* and their *Divines*, but such as was derogating from the Authority of the *Supream Pastor*, and prejudicial to the Lawes of the Church, they surceased all motions of reconciliation; rather chusing to expose themselves to all the dangers that might come from their armes and Rebellion.

Ibid. 6. Touching *the many Kings of England*, as he sayes, in *Popish times*, whose actions in his opinion, *shewed, that the work of Reformation, belonged especially to them in their Kingdom*: His Margin, indeed, quotes the Names of fourteen of our *Kings* since the *conquest*, as if he would have the world believe, the pure *Reformed Religion* were almost six hundred years old: But what *Reformations* were made by any of them, either in Religion or Church-Discipline, neither I, nor himself can shew, except by the last King *Henry* the Eighth, who was indeed a Reformer of the new fashion. 'Tis true, the former *Kings* had frequent quarrels with the *Court of Rome*, touching *Investitures, procuring of Bulls for determining causes belonging to the Kings Courts, usurping a disposal of Bishoprickes, and other Benefices*, &c. But what is all this to *Religion?* Such debates as these, he may see at this day, between the *Roman Court*, and the

the *Kings of France*, *Spain*, &c. in all which, commonly the Pope is but little a gainer; yet, notwithſtanding all theſe, he will not ſure deny, but that the Kings of *France* and *Spain*; and 'tis as certain, that all thoſe former Kings of *England*, except one, were perfect *Roman Catholicks*; not any of them ever did believe, that their *Supremacy* could allow them to alter the Religion of their Fore-Fathers: even King *Henry* the Eighth, for all his *Headſhip*, never pretended ſo far. Of this I dare accept, as Judge, even Sir *Edward Coke* himſelf, and *Balſamon* likewiſe, though a malicious *Schiſmatick*, therefore the fitter to be quoted by him; yet all he ſayes is, That the *Emperor has an inſpection over the Churches, that he can limit or extend the Juriſdiction of Metropolitans, erect new ones, &c.* which, whether by the ancient Lawes of the Church, he can do or no, is little for the *Preachers* purpoſe: I am ſure he is not able to prove it, or if he could, it is a Reformation which will not ſerve his turn. *Cokes* 5. Report. *Balſamon.*

7. His laſt *Examples* of *Reformations* made by Princes, is that of the *Kings of Juda*, in which indeed *Religion* it ſelf was Reformed. But withal, the Doctor may do well to take notice. 1. That thoſe *Kings* are no where ſaid to have reformed all the *Prieſts*, or the *High Prieſt*, or not

to have found him as Orthodox as themselves. 2. They are not said to have reformed the people against the *Priests*. 3. Or without the *Priests*. 4. Yea in several places we read, they were by the *Priests* assisted in their Reformation. And therefore *Bishop Andrews*, who was willing to make as much advantage of this example against the *Roman Church*, as might be, says only, that those *Kings* did reform *citra* or *ante*, *declarationem Ecclesiæ*, but he saies not, *contra*. And, to make good his *citra* or *ante*, hath only the strength of the *weakest* of all Arguments, a *Negative*, thus, *There is recorded no such Declaration of the Church in Scripture*, ergo *there was none*. The infirmity of which argument is much more visible, if applied to such a short History as that of the *Kings* and *Chronicles*, containing a relation of so many hundred years, and chiefly of the actions of Kings, not of the Clergy.

See 2 *Chron.* cap. 29. 4. 12. 16. *Ibid.* cap. 34.

Tort. Torti. p. 365.

8. It cannot indeed be denied, but that in such publick changes, the Power of *Kings* is more Operative and Illustrious then of the *Priests*, because their *Civil Sword* awes more than the others *Spiritual*, and therefore no wonder, if their part in such Reformations is more spoken of, especially in so very short a story. But certainly, according to Gods Institution, *the Priests lips are to preserve knowledge, and*

Mal. 2. 7.

it is from their mouths that (Kings) *are to learn Gods Law*, and what they are to Reform, *because they are the Angels of our Lord.* Now, for *Reformations*, or other *Eccleſiaſtical Ordinances* made by ſuch *Kings* as *David*, *Solomon*, &c. who, beſides a *Regal Authority*, were *Prophets* likewiſe, immediately inſpired and ſo employed by God, I ſuppoſe the Doctor will not draw ſuch into conſequence, to juſtify the actions of a *King Henry* the Eighth, the *young child his Son*, or *youngeſt Daughter*; no Prophets ſurely.

9. To theſe *examples alledged* by Doctor *Pierce*, but very inſufficient to juſtify the *Engliſh Reformation*, I will in the laſt place take notice briefly of one great motive, which, as he ſayes, ſet on work the *Engliſh Reformers (of happy Memory)*; *which was their obſerving that in the Council of Trent, the Roman Partizans, were not afraid to make new Articles of Faith, commanded to be embraced under pain of Damnation, as it were in contempt of the Apoſtles Denunciation*, Gal. 1. 8. Serm. pag. 13.

10. But to omit his contradictions, charging us with *hideous errors in Faith*, Pag. 12. which yet he dare not ſay are Fundamental, leſt he ruine his own Church: Pag. 9. To omit his uncivil language to the Biſhops of that Council, perſons of too honourable a quality, to be called, by a little

Doctor, *contemners of the Apostles denunciation, conspirators liable to a curse*: To omit his commending the first English Reformers, our *Kings*, &c. that they consulted not with flesh and blood, then which, what could be said more unluckily to himself? Did not our first Reformer consult sometimes with flesh and blood? Was *Henry* the Eighth so wholly spiritual? Do not your self confess, that *Sacrilege* and *Rebellion* help'd Reformation? To omit his petty Quibble, that the Church of *Rome* is but the younger Sister to that of *Brittain*: Directly contrary, not only to many of his brother Divines, but to the Head of his Church, King *James*, who, in a publick Speech to his Parliament, says, *I acknowledge the Church of Rome to be our Mother Church.* ---- To omit all these, and more, I shall desire the Doctor to take notice, that neither what the Church hath done in that Council is any *Novelty*, nor is it a *Novelty* that the Churches Adversaries should make such an objection: concerning which, the Reader may please to review what has been said before, *chap.* 20. *Sect.* 9. 10. & 11.

Pag. 13.

Pag. 35.

Stow. p. 840. Anno. 1603.

11. *Protestants* must impute this to their *first* Reformers, that the *Church* hath been forced to make such (as they call them) *new Articles of Faith.* For what would they have advised the *Council of Trent* to do

do, when the Churches ancient *Doctrines* and *Traditionary practises* were queſtion'd and condemned by *Innovators?* As yet ſuch *Doctrines*, &c. having never formerly been oppoſed, except by inconſiderable *Hereticks*; Such as *Jovinian*, *Vigilantius*, &c. whoſe Errors (before any Council could take notice of them, ſoon after they appeared, withered away again) were viſible only in the conſent and practiſe of *Catholicks*. But now it was neceſſary to declare *Conciliariter*, that they were unjuſtly queſtion'd, either of Error or Novelty. Muſt there be no *deciſions* in God's Church after the four firſt *General Councils?* For fear of new Articles, muſt liberty be given to *new Hereſies?* *Old Articles*, ſuch, as the Church had formerly occaſion from time to time to mention in her Creeds and Canons, will not ſerve the turn explicitly to condemn them, therefore *new ones muſt be excogitated* ſayes the *Council.* ‖ *New ones*, that is, *Old ones* further explained: Or, Old Practiſes *newly* declared to be *Traditions*.

‖ Conc. Chalcedon. ad Imperat. Marcian.

12. But ſurely theſe which are mentioned by the *Doctor*, and related to in his *margin*, are no *new Articles*; Moſt of them had been expreſly declared in former *Councils*; and all were as old at leaſt as *Chriſtianity* in *England*. For even St. *Gre-*

gory, who sent St. *Austin* hither to Preach the Gospel, is accused by learned Protestants of all, or most of these very Novelties which the Preacher objects. Doctor *Humphrey* ‖ accuseth him and St. *Austin* the Monk ---*Quod invexerunt in Angliam Purgatorium, &c. that they brought into England Purgatory; Oblation of the Salutary Host, and Prayers, for the Dead; Relicks; Transubstantiation.* To which ‖ *Osiander* adds, ---That *the same* Gregory *vehemently urged Celibacy of the Clergy; Invocation and Worship of Saints; nay, that the Idolatrous Veneration of Images also was by him approved, excused, defended.* To which *Carrion*, in his Relation of the state of the CHURCH in those dayes, adds, *That, when he tragically exclaim'd, that he abhorred the Appellation of Universal Bishop; yet at the same time he sufficiently declared his vehement desire of the thing which this Title signifies, in his assuming to himself such Authority over other Churches.* Here then are *Seven* of the Doctor's *Novelties*, confessed by Protestants themselves, to have been the Doctrines of St. *Gregory*, which the *English* here received with their Christianity (which also sufficiently appears, to those who are yet unsatisfied, out of *Bede*'s Ecclesiastical History of *England*, written about an hundred years after St. *Gregory*: of whom the

‖ In Jesuitism. Part. 2.

‖ Epist. Hist. Eccles. Cent 6.

the ſame *Oſiander* alſo relates, *That he was involved in all the Romiſh Errors concerning thoſe Articles wherein* (ſaith he) *we diſſent at this day from the Pope*: And for the *Two* others of the Doctor's *Points*, 1. *Publick Prayers* in an *unknown* Tongue, And, 2. *Infallibility*; himſelf confeſſeth the *firſt* of theſe to have been in *Gregories* time; For thus he, * *The Publick Prayers of the Romaniſts have been a very long time in an unknown Tongue, even as long as from the time of Pope* Gregory *the Great*. And the *ſecond* he muſt grant to have been pretended to before *Gregory*, in that the Preacher allows the proceedings of the Four firſt General Councils; for theſe required ſeveral Points not before determined to be believed by all Chriſtians under pain of *Anathema*, and alſo inſerted them into the body of the Chriſtian Creeds. Which thing the Doctor ſometimes thinks unreaſonable, that any fallible Authority ſhould aſſume to it ſelf. For ſurely upon this ground it is, that he condemns the Council of *Trent* for preſuming to make new Articles of Faith, though they have put none ſuch in our Creeds.

* Serm. pag. 27.

13. By which it appears, that this *Sermon*, and all the ſeverity practis'd againſt us in conſequence of it, might as juſtly have been preach'd and executed againſt

our

our first *Apostles*, St. *Gregory* and St. *Augustin* the *Monk*, as against us. And if against them, then against the *Universal Church* both *Eastern* and *Western*; since it is evident that in St. *Gregory*'s time they were in perfect Unity both for Doctrine and Discipline; And consequently, if such pretended *new Articles* can justifie the *English Separation* from the present Church, the same Separation ought to have been made from the *universal Church* above a *Thousand years* since. I might go higher, but this is even too too much. That man surely must have a prodigious courage, who dares venture his *Soul* and *Eternity* rather upon *Scripture* interpreted by an *Act of Parliament*, or the 39. *Articles*, than by the Authority and consent of the *Universal Church* for so many Ages.

I will conclude this so important Argument of *Schism* by a closer *Application*, which may afford more light to discover on which side the *Guilt* lyes. And this shall be done by making some Concessions, and propoſing some other Considerations, *&c.*

CHAP.

CHAP. XXIV.

Of Cauſal and Formal Schiſm *or* Separation; *and the vanity of their Diſtinctions. Conſiderations propoſed for a clear Examination on which ſide the Guilt of* Schiſm *lyes. The manifeſt Innocency of the* Roman Church.

1. FIrſt, As to the *Preacher*'s ſo commended *Diſtinction* of *Cauſal* and *Formal Schiſm*, it is borrowed from the *late Archbiſhop*: The former member whereof only he applies to the *Roman Catholick* Church, the later to no body: He muſt give me leave to propoſe to his Conſideration a Saying or two of St. *Auguſtin*, thus writing to the *Donatiſts*, *Si poſſit, quod fieri non poteſt, &c. If any could have, which really he cannot poſſibly, a juſt cauſe* Aug. Epiſt. 43.

cauſe for which he ſhould ſeparate his Communion from the Communion of the whole World, How do you know, &c. And again in the ſame Epiſtle, *There is the Church where firſt that* (Separation) *was made which you after perfected, if there could be any juſt cauſe for you to ſeparate from the communion of all Nations. For we are certainly aſſured that no man can juſtly ſeparate himſelf from the communion of all Nations, becauſe not any of us ſeeks the Church in his own Juſtice or Holineſs* (as you *Donatiſts* do) *but in the Divine Scriptures, where he ſees the Church really become, as ſhe was promiſed to be, ſpread through all Nations, a City on a Hill, &c.* Hence it is, that the ſame *Saint*, though he wrote ſeveral Books againſt the ſpecial *Doctrines* of the *Donatiſts*, yet whenſoever he treats of their *Schiſm*, he never meddles with any of their *Opinions*, but abſolutely proves their *Separation* unlawful from the Texts of Scripture, and Promiſes of Chriſt, which are abſolute and unconditional: So that the alledging *Cauſes* to juſtifie *Separation*, for which there can be no juſt one, is vain and fruitleſs; And this way of Arguing is far more forcible againſt *Engliſh Proteſtants*, than it was againſt the *Donatiſts*, becauſe all their ſober Writers acknowledge the Church of Chriſt was, and alwayes will be unerrable

in

in *Fundamentals*; and this as ſhe is a *Guide*: And further, that the *Roman* is either this Church, or at leaſt a true Member of it.

2. But Secondly, whatever becomes of this *Diſtinction*, his conceſſion is, *That really a Formal Schiſm there is between us*: nay more, that the Proteſtants made the *actual departure*, and indeed they muſt put out their eyes, who ſee it not. The *viſible Communion* between the now *Engliſh Church*, and all other in being before it beyond the Seas, is evidently changed and broken. The ſame *Publick Service* of God, which their firſt *Reformers* found in God's Church all the World over, they refuſe to joyn in, for fear of incurring ſin: Moſt of the *Eccleſiaſtical Laws*, every where formerly in force, they have abrogated, and without the conſent of any other Churches have made new: they were formerly Members of a *Patriarchical* Church (which they eſteem'd the only *Orthodox Univerſal Church*) to the Government of this *Common Body* they acknowledged themſelves ſubject: And a denial of ſubjection to the Common Governors of this Body, and eſpecially the *Supreme Paſtor*, they judged to be a formal *Act of Schiſm*: Laſtly, the common Doctrines of the Church they formerly embraced as of Divine Authority, *Traditionary*, Pag. 32.

nary, only ancient and *Primitive*: Now they are called *Apostatical Novelties*. Any of those changes conclude a *Schism* on one side or other, but all of them more then demonstrate it. A *Schism* then there is, therefore one of the parties is guilty (not of causing, but) of being *Schismaticks*, properly, formally, *Schismaticks*. Now would it not be hard for the *Doctor* to speak his conscience, and declare once more at Court, which of us two are properly *Schismaticks?* It could not indeed be expected he should answer as a *young maid* did to my *old Lady Falkland*, when she asked, if she were a Catholick? *No Madam*, (said she with a low curtesy) *if it please your Ladyship, I thank God I am a Scismatick*; but withal, his tongue would not readily pronounce *Roman Catholicks* to be *Schismaticks* from the English, Reformed *Church*.

Auguſt. Collat Carth. c. 3. 3. That which is opposed to *Schism*, is *Catholick Communion*. *We shew*, saith Saint *Augustine*, *by our Communion, that we have the Catholick Church*. Therefore in discourse of *Schism*, one while to talk of *Innovations of Doctrine, or of making a secession from a Church, twelve hundred years since, &c.* and perhaps, charging us with *causal Schism*: And on the other side, to acknowledg that the actual departure was indeed theirs, yet they are not *Scismaticks*, be-

Serm. pag. 32.

becauſe they *left the errors of Catholicks*, rather then them: Is indeed to act the very part of the *Donatiſts*, who, as Saint *Auguſtine* ſayes, *affirmed that the word* Catholick *was not derived from the univerſality of Nations, but from the plenitude of Sacraments, that is, from the integrity of Doctrine.* And in another place, writing to a *Donatiſt*, *Thou thinkeſt* (ſays he) *that thou haſt ſpoken acutely, when thou interpreteſt the Name Catholick, not of Univerſal Communion, but of obſervation of all Precepts, and Divine Myſteries.* And hence it was that the *Donatiſts* call'd their Biſhops, *Biſhops of Catholick Verity*, not of *Catholick Unity*, as St. *Auguſtine* ſays in the ſame *Epiſtle*. Aug. Brevic. Collat. lib. 3. Epiſt. 48.

4. I deſire to know, whether before their Reformation, our Church was *Schiſmatical*, or it began afterwards ſo to be? If it was ſo before, where was that Church from which we ſeparated? no where on earth ſure: And by conſequence either a ſeparation may be from no body, or the whole Church failed, *the gates of Hell* (contrary to our Saviours promiſe) *prevailed againſt it.* Again, if our Church became *Schiſmatical*, after their deſerting us, becauſe ſhe would not immitate them, or becauſe ſhe would not communicate with thoſe who held ſuch Doctrines; then it will follow (ſince the Church that was then, did in this, nothing vary from it's prede-

predeceſſors in a former age) that a Church remaining the ſame without any alteration at all, may be the only true *Church of Chriſt* to day, and the *Synagogue of Satan* to morrow. Theſe are Riddles unconceivable.

But, to demonſtrate that, even in Proteſtants opinion, we are not *Schiſmaticks*, there needs only this Proof, that generally *Proteſtants*, yea even *Hugenots*, acknowledge, that Salvation may be had in our Church; which no man, charging us with *Schiſm*, can ſay, if he knows the nature of *Schiſm*; how grievous and unpardonable a crime it is, that cuts off from the *Myſtical Body* of *Chriſt*.

5. On the other ſide, That the crime of *Schiſm* is truly and only to be charged on them (beſides the viſible marks of *leaving Communion, changing Government, Laws*, &c.) may be demonſtrated thus. There is no particular true Church, which is a Member of the Catholick, but thereby hath a power validly to *excommunicate* all thoſe that deſert her Communion, tranſgreſs her Laws, &c. And whoever are ſo excommunicated by her, are eſteem'd excommunicated by all other Catholick Churches. So that, if another *Biſhop* or Church, after information of this, ſhall receive them into their Communion, that *Biſhop*, &c. *ipſo facto* incurs *excommunication*

tion himſelf. Which excommunication, being according to the *Laws* of the *Church*, is valid and ratified in Heaven. Now ſuppoſe an *Engliſh Biſhop* ſhould excommunicate one of his Subjects for a total renouncing *Epiſcopal Government* and *Ordination*, and the perſon ſo excommunicated ſhould adjoyn himſelf to a Congregation of *Presbyters* in *Scotland*, *France*, *Holland*, &c. They would no doubt receive him: and being ſo received, he is, even in the *Biſhop's* own judgement, in as undoubted (though not ſo ſtraight) a way to Heaven, as he was before: becauſe the *Biſhop* himſelf acknowledges *Presbyterian Congregations* to be true *Reformed Churches* of God: ſo that by their Excommunication he is not cut off from Chriſt, but from preferments only. The late *Act of Uniformity* doth far more validly excommunicate *Non-Conformiſts*, then all their Biſhops Courts.

CHAP. XXV.

The Doctor's desire of Reconcilement, and the conditions of it. The necessary preparations thereto. Of the Court, and Church of Rome.

1. AFter all the Doctors triumphant Invectives against the *Catholick Church*, he yet concludes his *Sermon* in a less tempestuous stile: He says, he *hath* Pag. 36. *the Charity to wish for Reconcilement: That they departed with higher Degrees of Indignation from the insolent Court, then Church of* Rome. *That Court which proudly trod upon Crowns, and made Decrees with a non-obstante to Apostolical commissions, &c. That they were called Protestants, because they protested not so much against the Church, as against the cruel Edict made at* Worms, &c. *But yet when they wish a Reconcilement, they do not mean by compliance with any the*

the leaſt of our defilements, but by our Harmony with them in being clean.

2. If *Doctor Pierce* hath indeed the charity, and if he doth any more then with his tongue ſay, *they wiſh for Reconcilement*; they, that do ſo, will not want a reward from God for ſo much charity: And I doubt not there are a world of *Engliſh Proteſtants* (with him) who heartily wiſh the ſame. And they that have charity, will eaſily believe we wiſh ſo too. So that both parties being ſo far on the way to agreement, as to wiſh it: the next ſtep muſt be to endeavour to procure it. Our frequent endeavours, they know, have been to little purpoſe; We have oft in vain proteſted, that our *Doctrines*, practiſes, &c. have been miſunderſtood: we ſtill perſiſt in the ſame proteſtation: and perceive by this very Sermon that they are ſtill miſunderſtood: And whilſt they are ſo, that condition of *Reconcilement* which he makes is not unreaſonable, that they *will have no Reconcilement by a compliance with our defilements*. Therefore to take away this *miſunderſtanding*, let them obtain that for us, which we yet could never be able to do, a permiſſion to be heard ſpeak for our ſelves.

3. We paſs for *Traitors*, but cannot obtain to be informed wherein our *Treaſon* lies, nor what we muſt do to prove our

ſelves *no Traitors*. If the ackowledgement of his *Majeſties Supremacy* in as high a degree as they themſelves will allow, with excluſion of all manner of Temporal Authority in any other, be no *Treaſon*: If the expoſing our lives as willingly for Monarchy as they can do, be no *Treaſon*: If there be not any proof of faithful *Allegiance* which is refuſed to be ſubmitted to by us, what ſuſpicion can they have that we are *Traitors*? But our preſent *a la mode Treaſon* is, that our *Prieſts* receive their Ordination from *Rome*: and do not they ſo to? I am ſure we cannot anger them worſe, then to queſtion or doubt whether the *Church* of *England* hath received her *Miſſion*, *Orders* and *Juriſdiction* from the *Roman Church*.

4. For our *Doctrines*: I am perſwaded, if only this poor *Anſwer* fall into the hands of any ingenuous *Proteſtants*, who will ſeriouſly conſider the ſeveral Points ſo *Tragically* declam'd againſt by the *Preacher*, they will think even the Church of *England* little beholding to him for his *Sermon*, and *Truth* much leſs. But ſince ſmall effect can be expected from ſuch a *Treatiſe* as this, bound up to his blundering method; therefore, unleſs it be their intereſt, or as they may think, their ſafety, that our innocence ſhould be ſtifled and oppreſs'd, if they *have the charity to*

deed to wiſh for a Reconcilement, let them procure for us a peaceable authorized *Conference*, in which the only *Deſign* may be by conſent to enquire and ſet down clearly upon what terms a *Reconcilement* may follow, and without which it muſt not, nor ought to be expected. Let us underſtand one anothers *Churches*; let us know one anothers *eſſential Doctrines*: If there be any miſtakes, any miſinterpretations on either ſide, let them be cleared: But till this be done, and it can only be effected by them, they muſt pardon us, if according to the temper of calamitous, unjuſtly oppreſſed perſons, we *ſuſpect* that this laſt ſeemingly moderate paſſage of his *Sermon*, is in effect the moſt ſevere and bitter againſt us, as declared to be perſons with whom all *Reconcilement* is unlawful.

5. Certain I am this zealous *Preacher* is far from the prudent temper of *King James*, whoſe authority (being his Supreme Governor in all ſpiritual things as well as temporal) ſhould ſurely have more then an ordinary influence over him; That learned King in his before mentioned Speech, hath theſe remarkable words, *I could wiſh from my heart it would pleaſe God to make me one of the Members of ſuch a general Chriſtian union in Religion, as, laying wilfulneſs aſide on both hands, we might meet*

Stow. Chron. pag. 84. Anno 1603.

in the midſt, which is the Center and perfection of all things; For if they (of the Roman Church) *would leave and be aſhamed of ſuch new and groſs corruptions of theirs, as themſelves cannot maintain, nor deny to be worthy of Reformation; I would for my own part be content to meet them in the midway, ſo that all novelties might be renounced on either ſide.* See the condeſcence of this great King, and compare it with the ſtiff humor of this little Doctor----*He'l not comply with the leaſt of our defilements*; not he, Softly, good Sir, do you not as ill, when you comply with the *Lutherans*, who ſurely are not without ſome little ſtains? Do you not as ill, when you comply with the *Hugenots*, who are not at ſo perfect *a harmony with you in your being clean*? Look ſoberly into your own raſhneſs: you began the Separation (that hath bred ſo many wars, and ſo much licenciouſneſs both in faith and manners) upon points which your ſelves confeſs are not fundamental; and now you ſolemnly proteſt to continue it without complying in the leaſt difference between us. Go now, and cloſe your Sermon with a few ſoft words------ *Your arms are open to embrace, &c. your hearts are wide open to pray to God to bind up the breaches, &c. of his divided, defiled, diſgraced Spouſe*-----And when all's done, you'l not ſtir an inch towards the peace you

Pag. 35.

Pag. 35.

you so gloriously talk of. If this be Hypocrisie, remember, Doctor, the woes that attend it, if not, expresse your self so sincerely hereafter that we may not suspect it. For my part of all the faults in a *Sermon*, to that of dissembling I here declare a *Vitinian hatred*, as you learnedly call it.

Much more moderate were *Vives* and *Cassander*, whom you commend for complaining of some abuses in the Church (among other Authors which you there cite, jumbling Protestants and Catholicks confusedly together) for after all their zeal they dyed quietly in her bosom, and did not, like you, tear in pieces the seamless Coat of our SAVIOUR, and reject all terms of peace, unless every pretence of yours be satisfied to a tittle.

I remember too a dogged word you gave us, not far from the beginning of your Sermon; where after you had reckoned up *Socinians*, *Antinomians*, *Ranters*, *Solifidians*, *Millenaries*, *Reprobratarians*, &c. (a fine Peal to make a Pulpit ring) to all which you yield more antiquity then any will allow your Reformation, you pass them over with the gentler names of Heresie and Usurpation, but when you come to the *Pontificians*, you immediately grow high and rage, and resemble them to the *Mahometans*, &c. -----blind and impertinent Pag. 7, 8.

nent Paſſion! Do you not ſee abroad a civil and learned portion of Chriſtians in Communion with the Biſhop of *Rome*, and are they no better than *Mahometans*? Do you not ſee, in your own Country, and at Court too, Perſons ſo qualified, that you ſhould bluſh at your own unmannerlineſs to compare them to *Mahometans*?

6. If *their chief quarrel be againſt the Court of* Rome *for proudly treading upon Crowns, and making Decrees with a non-obſtante to*, &c. This might perhaps have been more ſeaſonable five or ſix hundred years ſince. But ſurely they know *Catholick Princes* are wiſer now, and the *Court of Rome* too. This needs not be the leaſt hindrance to a *Reconcilement*: On the contrary by a *Reconcilement* this *Church* and *Kingdom* would receive from the *Court of Rome*, only what *France*, *Spain*, &c. find extremely advantageous, both to the *honour* and *ſafety* of their Churches and States. And as for *Decrees* with a *non-obſtante*, he miſtakes the terms of *Apoſtolick Conſtitutions*, by which is intended Conſtitutions not made by the *Apoſtles*, but former *Popes*. And touching the Decree of the *Council of Conſtance* in his *Margin*, let me ask him a Queſtion or two: Do not *Proteſtants* in *Baptiſm* uſe ſprinkling inſtead of dipping, *non obſtante* that our

Pag. 35.

Sa-

Saviour and his *Apoſtles* inſtituted it otherwiſe? Do they not think themſelves obliged to communicate *faſting*, *non-obſtante*, that our *Saviour* inſtituted the *Sacrament* after Supper? Do they not without ſcruple eat *Black-puddings*, *non-obſtante* the *Apoſtles* gave a command to the contrary? All this they do, becauſe they think theſe things not *eſſential* or *unalterable*, but left to the prudence of their particular Church: Let them permit therefore the ſame liberty to a *General Council*.

And here give me leave to inſert ſome few Citations concerning the Proteſtant-acknowledgments of the Authority of Councils. Mr. *Ridley* ſayes, *Councils indeed repreſent the Univerſal Church, and being ſo gathered together in the Name of Chriſt, they have the promiſe of the Gift and guiding of the Spirit into all Truth.* Act. Mon. pag. 1288.

Doctor Bilſon plainly confeſſes, *the Preſence and Aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt for Direction of General Councils into all Truth*; And after fairly ſayes, *The Fathers in all Ages, as well before as ſince the Great Council of* Nice, *have approved and praſtis'd this of Councils as the ſureſt means to decide Doubts.* Perpet. Gov. p. 372, 373. Pag. 374.

----*Hooker* profeſſes, *The Will of God is to have us do whatever the Sentence of Judicial and final Deciſion ſhall determin, yea, though it ſeem utterly to ſwerve from what is right in our opinion.* Pref. to Eccl. Pol. pag. 28.

---- *Their Authority* (General Coun-

Dr. Potter. pag. 30.

Councils) *is immediately deriv'd and delegated from Christ*, sayes *Potter*. -----And if Doctor *Peirce* agree with these his Brethren, I might say Fathers, in this Point, I shall not easily fall out with him about it, but rather endeavour a further approach by offering this fair Proposal; I will not require of him to hold that the Fathers meet in Council to make question of the matters of Faith, for those they were taught from their Childhood; but to consult about their adversaries proofs, and what arguments should be alleadged against them; to consult how to express the Catholick Doctrine in such words as might best instruct the people, and prevent Hereticks from abusing them; Hence it was St. *Athanasius* said, *We meet here, not because we wanted a Faith*, i. e. were incertain what to hold, *but to confound those who go about to contradict the Truth*. Which Rule, if Councils observe, I think the Doctor would scarce refuse to obey them; and our only difference in this point, I hope, is, he thinks they do not observe this Rule, and I think they do.

Athan. in Ep. de Syn.

CHAP.

CHAP. XXVI.

The Preacher's boasting. Catholicks cannot justly be obliged to shew from Antiquity Evidences of their Doctrines. Conditions necessary to be Observed by the Doctor, in case he Reply. Of the Name Protestant.

1. THus I have gone through, and examin'd (except to those who love to be contentious) sufficiently, all the pretended *Novelties* imputed by Dr. *Pierce* to the Roman Catholick Church; I have likewise brought to the *Test* all the Allegations made by him, either to excuse the *English Churches Separation* from the *Roman Catholick*, or at least to perswade us not to call it *Schism:* And it seems to me, I have demonstrated him unsuccessful

ſul in both. Nay more, (which is a great miſery, if he would conſider it with that ſeriouſneſs, which *Eternity* deſerves) I think I have prov'd that the fearful crime of *Sebiſm* will lye heavie upon his *Church*, though he had ſhew'd all the Points by him mention'd, to be *Novelties*. And having done this, I muſt ſay with St. *Auguſtin*, *Utinam verba iſta infuderim, & non effuderim.* But conſidering the preſent temper of this Age, I doubt, I ſhall have reaſon to fear, according to the ſame holy Father's expreſſion, leſt, *when I beg them to afford their ears, they ſhould make ready their teeth.*

2. However I hope the *Doctor* will no more be believed with any reaſon to complain (as he doth in his *Sermon*) of *one remarkable infirmity in the Popiſh Writers,*

Pag. 14. ---- *They ever complain we have left their Church, but never ſhew that* Iota *as to which we have left the Word of God, or the Apoſtles, or the yet uncorrupted and Primitive Church, or the Four firſt General Councils.* Truly, this Speech of his ſeems to me ſo vain, and raſh, and ſhameleſs a boaſt, that I cannot but bluſh for him, when I read it, and tremble for him when I ſee *Truth* ſo little conſider'd by a *Preacher*, ſuſtaining God's Perſon, as he pretended.

3. But perhaps I underſtand not his phraſe of [*ſhewing that* Iota *as to which they*

they have left, &c.] If he mean we have not demonſtrated their deſerting *Antiquity*, or, that we believe not, even ſince we have ſeen their *Anſwers*, that our demonſtrations are unanſwerable; there are extant whole *Libraries* of our *Controverſies*, ſufficient to overwhelm him. Particularly, before he ſay ſo again, let him enquire out and conſider a Book, written by *Simon Vigorius*, Counſeller to the *French King*, enticuled, *An Aſſertion of the Catholick Faith out of the Four firſt Oecumenical Councils, and other received Synods within that time.* Or even, let him review what is quoted againſt him here ‖ concerning one of his own Points, *Celibacy of the Clergy*, out of the Four firſt General, and ſeveral other, as ancient, Provincial Councils. Before all which Councils there is found an Injunction of it as high as *Calixtus* his dayes about *A.D.* 220. which alſo Doctor *Peirce* mentions. Doth not this prohibition of the Prieſts from Marriage amount *to the magnitude of an* Iota *with him?* How comes it then to be one of his *Grievances* in this *Sermon*, and that under no milder a phraſe than *the Doctrine of Devils?* Or will not ſuch Antiquity paſs for Primitive, and Antiquity *Antique enough* (to uſe his words)? Unleſs he will ſhrink up Primitive Antiquity from the 6th Age to the 4th, from the

Cha. 17. Sect. 10.

Pag. 9.

the 4th to the 3d. (where few Writings being extant, less of the Churches Doctrines and Customs can be shewn in them) Or from the 3d to the 1st Age and the Apostles times (as the *Presbyterians*, in the Plea of Antiquity, treat the *Prelatists*.) For on this manner even the most learned of the *Protestant* Writers, when they are straitned with proofs, are wont to retire. So Bishop *Jewel* long ago made a bold challenge to be tryed by Antiquity for the first 600 years.

But after many hot Encounters between the Controvertists, and after Antiquity better discover'd to the later Pens on the Protestant Party than to the first, *A. Bp. Laud*, more cautious, contracts the Protestants Challenge somewhat narrower to the Fathers of the first 400 years, or thereabouts, *The Protestants* (saith he ‖) *offer to be tryed by all the ancient Councils and Fathers of the Church within the first 400 years, and somewhat further.* And, since the *A. Bp.* Doctor *Hammond* makes his Plea of Antiquity yet shorter, *viz.* for the Fathers of the first 300 years; *For the particular Doctrines* (saith he ‖) *wherein we are affirmed by the Romanists to depart from the Unity of the Faith, we make no doubt to approve our selves to any that will judge of the Apostolical Doctrines and Traditions by the Scriptures, and consent of the first*

Sect. 28. p. 217

‖ Of Schism, c. 8. sect. 7.

first 300 years, or the Four General Councils. —— And again, *We profeſs* (ſaith he ‖) *to believe ſo much, and not to be convinced by all the Reaſons, and Authorities, and Proofs from Scriptures, or the firſt Chriſtian Writers, thoſe of the firſt 300 years, or the Four General Councils.* Where by ſubmiſſion to the Four firſt General Councils, he means only to the bare *decifions* of theſe Councils in matters of Faith concerning our Saviour and the Holy Ghoſt, not obliging himſelf alſo to the Authority of thoſe Fathers, who flouriſhed in the time of theſe Four Councils, and ſate in them. For, though the laſt of theſe Councils was held in the middle of the 5th Age, yet he claims a tryal by the Fathers only to the end of the 3d Age. Again, by this ſubmiſſion to the Writers of the Three firſt Ages only, he bars moſt of the chief Fathers, and all thoſe that are more large and Voluminous, from bearing any witneſs againſt Proteſtants, and leaves ſcarſe half a ſcore Authors of Note now extant, and ſeveral, writing only ſome ſhort Treatiſes or Epiſtles, whereby they are content to try all the Doctrine and Diſcipline of Antiquity.

‖ Ibid. c. 9. ſect. 7.

4. But theſe were timorous Souls that would fain be thought to deal civilly with antiquity; let us hear two or three bolder ſpirits, that ſpeak plain and freely: What ſayes

Willets Survey of Common-Prayer. p. 18. sayes Doctor *Willet? Let not your Majesty be deceived by the Popish Arguments of supposed antiquity, as* Joshua *was with the old and mouldy bread of the Gibeonites*; and the reason is given, *for Anti-christ began to raign in the Apostles dayes, in St.* Pauls *dayes.*

Strang. li. 6. pag. 296. What says *Acontius? Some of us are come to that, that they will fill up their Writings with the Authority of the Fathers, which I would to God they had performed with prosperous success, as they hopefully attempted it, &c. I onely think this custome is most dangerous, and altogether to be eschewed.* What sayes the witty *Whitacre? The Popish Religion is a patcht coverlet of the Fathers Errors sewn together.* And again, *to believe by the Testimony of the Church* (not excepting any Age) *is the plain Heresie of the Papists.* To conclude (for I might quote all day long upon this Subject) what sayes the Patriark of Protestancy, *Luther, There never was any one pure Council, but either added something to the faith or substracted.*

Contr. Dur. lib. 6. p. 423.

Idem. lib. 1. de Script p. 39.

Luth. in Act. Apost. ca. 15.

And now, what shall we say our selves in this confused variety? Against some of our Adversaries, we must cite antiquity, or else we do nothing; against others, if we cite all the antiquity that ever was baptized, we do nothing. God deliver them from their cross and incertain wandrings, and me from the wearinesse of following them in their wild chase.

5. But

5. But, if the *Doctor* means by [*shewing that Iota, as to which, &c.*] that we have not so *shewed it*, as to stop their mouths, or to force them to confess and repent of their fault, then there can be no *shewing* any thing by any one party to another, as long as the dissention lasts between them. In this sence they have *never shewed one Iota* to the *Presbyterians*, *Anabaptists*, *Quakers*, *&c* who (after all their *Books*, *Canons*, *Acts of Vniformity*, *&c.* which those Sects call *Antichristian*, *tyrannical Popery*, as the *Protestants* did ours) still persist in separation from them. Then neither the *Apostles*, *antient Fathers*, or *Councils* ever *shewed* one *Iota* to antient *Pagans* or *Heretics*: because, for all their *shewing*, others remained *Pagans* and *Heretics* afterward. And yet, even in this particular, though a very unreasonable one, we *Catholics* can confidently affirm, that we have defeated this *bravado* of the *Preacher*. For a vident Truth on our side has extorted from the mouths and pens of a world of the most learned among the *Reformed Writers*, a *Confession* both in general and in every particular Controversie, that *Antiquity* declares it self for the *Roman Church* against them. Thousands of such proofs may be read in the *Protestants Apology*, the *Triple Cord*, *&c.* Books written on purpose to reckon up such Confessions. This is truly, if well considered, an advantage strange and extraordinary: for I believe never did any of the *Antient Heretics* so far justifie the *Catholic Church*, but such confessions of theirs are recorded by the *Antient Fa-*

thers: which shews that, above all former examples, the *Heretics* and *Schismatics* of this last Age are most properly [*διʼ ἑαυτῶν κατακριτοι*] condemned by their own Consciences.

6. But withall the *Doctor* must take notice of this one thing, That it does not belong to us *Catholics* to be obliged *to shew that Iota, in which they* (who have set up a new and separated Church from us but the other day) *have left the word of God or Primitive antiquity, or the four first General Councils*; it belongs to them, who have thus divided themselves, not only to shew, but to demonstrate first most clearly, that there is such a discession from those Scriptures, Fathers, and Councils, by that former Church (which they deserted) not in an *Iota* but in some grand principle of our Faith, which admitted no longer safety to them in her Communion; because the *Roman Catholic Church* is in *possession*: and, by our *Adversaries* own Confession, has been unquestionably so for above a Thousand years, of all or most of her present *Doctrins* for which they have relinquished her. Particularly *the Pope* has enjoyd an Authority and *Supremacy* of Jurisdiction a longer time, than any succession of *Princes* in the world can pretend to; A Jurisdiction acknowledged as of Divine Right, and as such submitted to by all our *Ancestors*, not only as *Englishmen*, but as Members of the whole Western Patriarchat, yea of the *Universal Church*, and this as far as any Records can be produced. *He* is now, after so many Ages, question'd and violently deposed

See cap. 23. Sect. 13.

from

from this Authority by one *National Church*, nay by one single *Woman* and her *Counsel* (the universality of her Clergy proceſting againſt her proceedings) and much more againſt her deſtroying a Religion *from the Beginning* eſtabliſh'd among us, and which had never been queſtion'd here in former times but by a *Wiclef*, or a *Sir John Oldcaſtle*, &c. manifeſt Heretics and Traytors. Now it is againſt all *Rules* of *Law*, *Juſtice* and *Reaſon*, that ſuch as are *Poſſeſſores bonæ fidei*, ſhould be obliged to produce their *evidences*: This belongs only to the Plaintiffs, and no Evidences produced by them againſt ſuch a Poſſeſſion can be of any force, except ſuch as are manifeſt demonſtrations of an *Uſurpation*, yea ſuch an *Uſurpation* as cannot either be exerciſed, or ſubmitted to without ſin.

7. The Doctor is likewiſe to conſider, that if, *ex ſuper abundanti*, we ſhould yield ſo far, as out of *Antient Records* of *Councils* or *Fathers* to alledge any *Proofs* to enervate their claim to them, and juſtifie our Poſſeſſion: *Such Proofs* of ours, though conſidered in themſelves, were only *probable*, yet in effect would have the force of *demonſtrations* againſt *Engliſh Proteſtants*: But on th'other ſide, unleſſe they can produce from *Scripture* or *Antiquity*, *evident demonſtrations* againſt us, they are not ſo much as *probabilities*: all this by their own confeſſion. For, as has been ſhew'd, they lay it for a ground, and acknowledge the *Catholic Church* (of which according to their own Doctrine the *Roman* is at leaſt a Member) to be in all

fundamental Points infallible: and that in all other Points, now in debate, which are not *fundamental*, it would be unlawful for particular Churches to profesſe any diſſent from her, without an evident demonſtration, that ſhe has actually and certainly erred in them; yea moreover, that ſhe will admit none of the Diſſenters into her Communion, except ſuch as (though againſt their Conſciences and Knowledge) will ſubſcribe to her Errors, Errors ſo heynous, as to deſerve and juſtifie a ſeparation.

8. Theſe things premiſed, my laſt care muſt be to provide, that, in caſe a *Reply* be intended to this *Treatiſe*, it may not be ſuch an one as may abuſe the world. The *Preacher* muſt conſider it is not ſuch another blundering *Sermon* that will now ſerve his turn to give ſatisfaction, ſo much as to any *Proteſtant*, who has a Conſcience guided by the light of Reaſon, or thinks *Schiſm* not to be a ſleight *Peccadillo*. Therefore that he may know, what *Conditions* are neceſſary to render an *Anſwer* not altogether impertinent and inſupportable, I here declare, that, in caſe he ſhall undertake a confutation of what is here alledged by me to diſprove the charge of *Novelties* by him laid on the *Roman Catholick Church*, and the excuſing of *Schiſm* in his own, he will be a betrayer of his own Soul, and the Souls of all thoſe that rely on him, unleſs he obſerve the Conditions following.

9. The firſt is, ſince if *Proteſtants* have in truth an evident *demonſtration* that the *Roman Doctrine*, for which they ſeparate, are indeed ſuch

such pernicious *errors* and *Novelties*, we readily grant they are not obliged to subscribe them; And it being supposed by the *Archbishop, &c.* that, without such a certainty, it would have been unlawfull for *Protestants* to question or censure such former *Doctrins* of the Church; The *Doctor* is bound, and I here adjure him to declare expressly, as in the presence of Him, who is *Supreme Head of the Church*, and will revenge severely all calumnious persecutions of it, that he is demonstratively *certain*, that in all these *Points*, charged by him on the *Church* of later times as *Novelties* and *Errors* introduced since the *four first Councils*, she is manifestly guilty: and that nothing appears in this, or any other *Catholik book* of his Acquaintance, which deserves to be esteem'd so much as a *probable proof* to the contrary. For my part I here protest on the other side, that I find not any one concluding allegation in his *Sermon*, nor believe there can any be produced, which can warrant him to make such a Declaration.

10. The *second Condition* is, That in like manner he professe he can or hath demonstratively proved by *Scripture* or *Primitive Antiquity*, the main grounds, upon which they pretend to justifie their *separation* to be no *schism*, to wit, these. 1. That the *universal Church*, represented in a Lawfull *General Council* may in *points of doctrin* not *fundamental* so mislead the *Church* by *errors*, that a particular Church, &c. discovering such *errors*, may be obliged to separate externally. 2. That a particular *Christian*

stian or a *Congregation Diocesan* may lawfully reverse *Decisions* formerly made by a *National Synod*, and assented to by it; and that a *National Council* may do the like in regard of a *Patriarchical*, or any of them, in regard of an *Oecumenical* formerly accepted and admitted. If these *assertions* be *Innovations*, as in our perswasion they are, it is clear they destroy all possible *unity*: If they be not, let some demonstrative *Proofs* and *Examples* be produced out of *Antiquity*, that a receiving of such order and subordination has been practised and approved in the Catholic Church. 3. That a *particular Church*, &c. in opposition to the *Universal*, can judge what *Doctrines* are *fundamental* or *necessary* to all *Persons*, *States*, *Communities*, &c. and what not: And that a *Catalogue* of such *Doctrines* be given by the *Respondent*, or *demonstrative* reasons alledged why such an one is not necessary. *Thirdly*, If he will deny the *Church of England* has separated externally from the present *Universal Church*, but only from the *Roman*; then, to make this good, he is obliged to name what other *visible* Member of the *Universal Church* they continue in *Communion* with, in whose *publick Service* they will joyn or can be admitted, and to whose *Synods* they ever have, or can repair. And, since at the time of their first *Separation*, they were only in *Communion* with the *Roman Catholic Church*, and the Members of it, he must shew how, when, and where they entered into any other new *Communion*. Lastly, Since the *English Church*, by renouncing not only several *Doctrines*, but several

veral Councils acknowledged for *General*, and actually ſubmitted to both by the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Churches*, hath thereby ſeparated from both theſe, he muſt find out ſome other pretended *Members* of the *Catholic Church* divided from both theſe, (that is, ſome that are not manifeſtly *heretical*,) with whom the *Engliſh Church* communicates.

12. A *fourth Condition* is, that he muſt either declare other *Calviniſtical Reformed Churches*, which manifeſtly have no ſucceſſion of lawfully Ordained *Miniſters*, enabled validly to celebrate and *adminiſter Sacraments*, to *conſecrate*, *confirm*, preach *God's Word*, &c. to be no *heretical* or *Schiſmatical Congregations*: Or if they be, he muſt demonſtrate how the *Engliſh Church* can acquit her ſelf from *Schiſm*, ſince her *Biſhops* and *Divines* have authoritatively repaired to their * *Synods*, and a general permiſſion is given to any *Proteſtant Writers* to acknowledg *them* true, reformed, and ſufficiently *Orthodox Congregations*.

* A.D. 1618. at Dort.

13. The laſt ſhall be, that he abſtain from imputing to the *Catholic Church* the opinions or ſayings of particular *Writers*. The Church her ſelf having ſufficiently declared her Doctrines in her *Councils*, eſpecially that of *Trent*. If he will combate againſt her, there he has a fair and open *field*, and charity requires that he affix to her *Deciſions* the moſt moderate and beſt qualified ſenſe: Otherwiſe he will declare himſelf as one, who is ſorry *his Mother* ſhould not be ill reputed. Now in exchange, I for my part am extreamly willing to proceed

in the same manner with the *English Church*. I would fain charge her with nothing but her own declared *Doctrines* and *Decisions*. But truly I know not where to find them, except only in the little *Primmer* and *Catechism* for Children. For the 39. *Articles*, being almost all *Negatives*, may as well be reputed the Doctrines of *Jewish*, or *Turkish Congregations*, since these also *deny the Sacrifice of the Masse, Purgatory, Infallibility of Councils*, &c. other *Reformed Churches* have published reasonably large *Professions* of their *Faith*, they have declared their own positive sense in almost all Points of *Christian Belief*, as the *Hugenots* in *France*, &c. the *Lutherans* in *Germany*, &c: only the English Church seems to have made a *secret* of her *Faith*; upon what motive I am unwilling to guess.

14. These *Conditions* in themselves so *reasonable*, and even according to *Protestant* grounds also, so *necessary*, if the *Replyer shall refuse to perform*, he will, in the judgment of all discerning Readers, be himself the *Answerer* and *Confuter* of his own *Reply*; and withall, will shew it is not *Truth* or *Peace* he aims at, but the satisfying his own, or others interests, passions and revenge against those who least deserve it. All subterfuges, all involved intricacies in answering, all discourses which are not open, candid, and sincere, will be confessions of guilt: He may perhaps hide the weakness of his cause from credulous Women, Trades-men, or possibly the more unlearned part of our *Gentry*, but to all considering

Readers,

Readers, his *Art* of *hiding* will be his moſt manifeſt *diſcovery*. *Ariſtotle* ſaies, the *Sepia* is the wiſeſt of all *Fiſhes*, becauſe ſhe conceals her ſelf by caſting forth round about her a black humour, which hinders the ſight of her. But on the contrary, *Julius Cæſar Scaliger* affirms ſhe is of all *Fiſhes* the moſt imprudent, *Quia cum ſe putat latere, prodit ſeipſo latibulo*; for the Fiſhermen are ſure to find her under her inky humour.

15. And now having finiſhed our Anſwer to the ſubſtance wherein we differ, let us conclude with the Name that diſtinguiſhes us: He puts us in mind of the reaſon why the *Lutherans*, and from them other Reformerd took the name, *Proteſtants*, for *proteſting* againſt the bloo- Page 36.
dy Edict of *Worms*, *Spires*, &c. we find little ground why the *Reformers* in *England* ſhould borrow that title. Againſt what Armes or Armies did they ever *proteſt*? What Edicts were made againſt them? We *Catholics* might rather aſſume ſuch a title, if it were of any ſpecial honor, having ſeen (and felt too) Edicts of another and far more bloody nature made againſt us: Nay (thanks to ſuch *Sermons*) we ſee at this day Edicts, ſevere enough, publiſhed, and worſe preparing, not againſt Subjects in Arms and actual Rebellion, as the *Lutherans* were againſt the *Empire*, but againſt ſuch, as the Law-givers, and Law-perſwaders know mean no harm; againſt ſuch as would be both moſt watchful & aſſiſting to eſtabliſh the peace of the Kingdom: Edicts, to draw all the remainder of blood out of our veins, which have been al-

moſt

most emptied in our Kings and Countries Cause; though our hope is still in the mercy of our gracious Sovereign, and the prudent moderation of those about him.

16. Yet sanguinary Sermons are greater Persecutions than sanguinary Laws; for Laws may and sometimes are qualifi'd by the equity of Judges, and in particular those against *Roman Catholics* have often been allay'd by the gracious clemency of our Kings. But the uncharitable Sermons, that call for blood, inspire fury into mens hearts, make compassion esteem'd unlawful, and the most savage cruelty the best Sacrifices of Religion. The truth is, Pulpits have been the Sources whence so much blood has flow'd in this Kingdom, which Sources, if they had been open'd by such as *Smectymnuus*, whose vocation is Rebellion against the Princes, and barbarous inhumanity to all that are not of their faction, *Sustinuissemus utiq;*— and so we shall do still with the help of Grace, by whose hands soever Almighty God presents us this Cup. *Quod voluit factum est, & quod fecit bonum est. Sit nomen Domini benedictum.* AMEN.

PSAL. 108. 3. & 73. 2.

Pro eo ut me diligerent, detrahebant mihi:
Ego autem orabam,
Memento Congregationis tuæ, quam possedisti AB INITIO.

FINIS.

The

The CONTENTS.

CHAP. I. Of Doctor Pierce's *Sermon in general.* Sect. 1,2.
What was probably the design of it. 3,4.
Catholicks persecuted, though their best friends. 6,7.

CHAP. II. Page 8. } *Eleven* Novelties *charged on Catholics.* 2.
Schism imputed to them. 3.
Why necessary the Sermon should be refuted. 4,5.
The Answerers Protestation of sincerity. 6,7.

CHAP. III. Page 13. } B. Jewels *Challenge imitated by the Doctor.* 1,5.
Primitive Reformers Acknowledgment. 2,3,4.
The Doctors Notion of Beginning, 6.
Questions proposed touching that Notion. 8.9,10,11.

CHAP. IV. Page 29. } *The sum of the Doctors Discourse against the Popes Supremacy enervated by himself.* 1,2,3.
The Churches Doctrine therein. 4.
The Text, Mark 10.42. *cleared.* 5,6.

CHAP. V. Page 36. } *The Doctor obliged to acknowledge submission due to the Popes Authority, as exercised during the Four General Councils.* 1,2.
Of the Title of Universal Bishop. 3,4,5.
Not generally admitted at this day. 6,7.

CHAP. VI. Page 44. } *The absolute necessity of a* Supreme Pastor *in the Church.* 1,2,3.
Supremacy of Jurisdiction exercised by Boniface III. *his Predecessors.* 4,5,6,7.
The 28. *Canon of* Chalcedon *Illegal.* 8.

Of

Of the second Canon of the Council of Constantinople. Sect. 9,10.

CHAP. VII. } *The Popes Supremacy confirmed by a Law of*
Page 54. } *the Emperor Valentinian.* 1,2.
Decrees of Popes, their Ancient force. 3,4.
The Popes Supreme Jurisdiction confirmed by the Eastern Church. 5,6,7,8,9.
Appeals to the See Apostolick decreed at Sardica; British Bishops present. 11,12.
Of the first Council at Arles. 13,14.
Sixth Canon of the Nicene Council explained. 15.16,17.

CHAP. VIII. } *Proofs of the Popes Supreme Jurisdiction, be-*
Page 67. } *fore first Council of Nice.* 2,3,5.
How all Apostles and all Bishops equal, and how subordinate. 6,7.
St. Peter had more then a Primacy of Order. 8.9,10.
Of St. Pauls resisting St. Peter. 11,12
Objections Answered. 13,15.
The Popes Supremacy not dangerous to States. On the contrary, &c. 18,20,22.
Protestants writing in favour of it. 25,26.

CHAP. IX. } *The Churches Infallibility.* 2,3,4.
Page 89. } *The Necessity thereof.* 8,9.
The Grounds whereon she claims it. 10, 12, 14, 15.
Objections Answered. 16,18.

CHAP. X. } *Prayer for the dead.* 3,4,5.
Page 109. } *Its Apostolick Antiquity.* 6,7,9.
Purgatory not necessarily supposed in it. 11,12.
Objections Answered.

CHAP. XI. } *Transubstantiation.* 2,3,4,6,8.
Page 121. } *Justified by Authority of the Fathers.* 10. *Ob-*

Objections Answered Sect. 12, 14, 15

CHAP XII. Communion under one Species. 2.
Page 137. *Confirmed by the practice of the Primitive Church in private Communions.* 3, 4, 5, 6.
No cause of Separation. 7, 8.

CHAP. XIII. The Sacrifice of the Mass. 1.
Page 143. *Asserted universally by Antiquity.* 2, 3, 4.
The true Doctrine concerning it explain'd. 5, 6, 7.

CHAP. XIV. Veneration of Images. 1.
Page 151. *The Churches Approved practice of it most suitable to reason.* 2——13.

CHAP. XV. *The Churches prudence in restraining the too free* Page 163. *use of* Scripture *from the unlearned.* 2, 4, 5.
Our late miseries justly ascribed to a defect in such Prudence. 6.
Of Prayer not in a vulgar Tongue. 7, 8.
The Causes and Grounds thereof. 9, 10.
That Practice not contrary to St. Paul. 11, 12, 13.

CHAP. XVI. Invocation of Saints. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6.
Page 178. *Proved out of Antiquity.* 7, 8, 9, 10.
Concessions, Deductions, and Objections Answered. 11. ad ult.

CHAP. XVII. Celibacy of Priests. 2, 3, 4.
page 201. *Vows of Chastity.* 5, 6.
The Doctrine and Practice of the Church in both. 9, 10.
Objections Answered. 12, 13, 14, 15.

CHAP. XVIII. Divorce, *and the several kinds of it.* 2.——7.
page 219. *The Practice of the Roman Church manifestly mistaken by the Preacher.* 8. to 17.

Of

CHAP. XIX. Of Schism. Sect. 1.
page 225. The unpardonableness of that crime acknowledged by Antiquity. 2,4,6.
No cause or pretence can excuse it. 7,8.

CHAP. XX. The Preacher vainly endeavors to excuse his
page 233. Church from Schism. 3,4,5. and chapter 21. Sect. 15,16.
Of the Subordination of Church-Governours and Synods. 13
The unappealable Authority of General Councils acknowledged by Antiquity. 8.
Of the decisions of later Councils. 9,10,11,12.

CHAP. XXI. The Fundamental Rule of Church-Govern-
page 249. ment. 1,2.
Limitations of the Authority of General Councils. 5,6.
Their Grounds made by A. B. Lawd, Dr. Field, &c. 3,4.
Of Points Fundamenal and non — 7,8,12.
Protestants allow not so much Authority to General Councils as God commanded to be given the Sanhedrim. 13,14.
Of the pretended Independence of the English Church from the Example of Cyprus. 17.

CHAP. XXII. Limitations of the Churches Authority, by
page 265. A. B. Lawd, &c. examin'd. 1,2,3,4.
Objections against the proceedings in the Council of Trent answered. 5,6.
Manifest Illegality in Q. Eliz. Reformation. 7,8,9,10,11.
Secular and carnal ends in it. 12,13.

CHAP. XXIII. The Doctors Proofs alledged to justifie the
page 284. English Separation, answered. 1,2.
1. From the independent Authority of our Kings. 3.
2. From

2. *From the Example of* Justinian *and other Emperors.* 4,5.
3. *From the practice of fourteen of our Kings.* 6.
4. *From the Example of the Kings of* Judah. 7,8.
In what sense new Articles *of Faith are made by the Church in the Council of* Trent. 10.11,12,13.

CHAP. XXIV. page 291. *Of Casual and Formal* Schism: *and the vanity of their distinctions.* 1,2.
Considerations for a clear Examination, on which side the guilt of Schism *lies.* 3,4.
The manifest Innocency of the Roman Church. 5.

CHAP. XXV. page 298. *The Doctors desire of Reconcilement, and the Conditions of it.* 1,2,3.
The necessary Preparations to it. 4,5.
Of the Court and Church of Rome. 6.

CHAP. XXVI. page 307. *The* Preachers *boasting.* 1,2,3.
Catholicks cannot justly be obliged to shew from Antiquity Evidences of their doctrines. 6,7.
Conditions necessary to be observed by the Doctor, *in case he Reply.* 8,9,10,12,13,14.
Of the name Protestant. 15,16.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

PAge 11. line 15. *read* wilful insincerity. p. 15. l. 8. *r.* thinks. p. 38. l. 4. *r.* Epistemon. p. 50. l. 11. *r.* was no need. p. 52. l. 8. *r. sorry.* p. 55. l. 29. *r. Hilarus.* p. 65. l. 1. *r.* that as the —— p. 66. l. ult. *r. Socrates.* p. 72. l. 21. *r. instilled.* p. 80. l. 22. *dele* to. p. 107. l. 8. *r. Grathus.* p. 118. l. 7. *r. Damon.* & l. 29. *r.* 490. p. 133. l. 11. *r. Synesius.* p. 163. *Upon, bitter and cruel death.* p. 166. l. 31. *r. written* Copies. p. 189. l. 7. *r. Book.* p. 244. *for* Acacius read Cæsarius. p. 278. l. 3. *r.* (Thus likewise p. 281.) FOX. *to make, but* —— p. 301. in margin. *r.* pag. 241. p. 312. in margin. *r. Willet. Synop. Papis. Quæst.* 3. *and Survey of Cath. Fr. p.* 18. & b 10. *r.* with *as prof.* —— p. 322. l. 28. *r. their* Princes.

Some Pages and Sections are misnumbered.